PHILITAS OF COS

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H. S. VERSNEL

D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P. H. SCHRIJVERS

S.R. SLINGS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM VICESIMUM NONUM

KONSTANTINOS SPANOUDAKIS

PHILITAS OF COS

CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDUM

– p. 92, fr. 21, *app. crit.*: for 'Snell ap. *SH l.l.*' read 'Snell, *Gnomon* 25 (1953), 434'
– p. 198, fr. 18, 4th line: to 'Craik 15' add ', R. Parker – D. Obbink, *Chiron* 30 (2000), 442f.'
– p. 348, fr. 32, for "ποδονιπτῆρα δῖνον" read "ποδονιπτῆρα δεῖνον". Delete the following parenthesis.

PHILITAS OF COS

BY

KONSTANTINOS SPANOUDAKIS

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2002

Των γονιών μου

ἄνευ Ὁμήρου, ἄνευ ἑξαμέτρων

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Spanoudakis, Konstantinos.
Philitas of Cos / by Konstantinos Spanoudakis.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958; 229)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 9004124284 (alk. paper)
1. Philåtas, 330-270 B.C.—Criticism and interpretation. 2. Greek poetry, Hellenistic—History and criticism. 3. Love poetry, Greek—History and criticism. 4. Kos Island (Greece)—Biography. I. Title. II. Series.
PA4267.P67 Z85 2001
881'.01—dc21 2001052445

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Spanoudakis, Konstantinos:
Philitas of. Cos / by Konstantinos Spanoudakis. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2002
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; Vol. 229)
ISBN 90-04-12428-4

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 12428 4

© Copyright 2002 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface xi

Abbreviations and Bibliography xiii

Testimonia 1

Alleged Testimonia 12

Introduction 19

I. Name 19

II. Date, *patria* and *familia* 23

IIIa. 'Pupils': Ptolemy Philadelphus 26

IIIb. Zenodotus, Hermesianax and Bittis 29

IVa. The Coan Statue 34

IVb. Claim for Heroic Honours 37

V. Theocritus 40

VIa. The *Aetia*-prologue: Mimnermus, Antimachus and Philitas 42

VIb. Callimachus' *Somnium* and fr. 532 (T. 6), the *Pinakes* and the Elegiac Canon 47

VII. Relations with Contemporary Poets 50

VIII. Treatment of Literary Past: Hesiod, Pindar, Philoxenus 52

IX. Comic *leptotes* 54

Xa. Survival 55

Xb. Propertius 59

Xc. Longus 64

Xd. Virgil 66

XI. Hellenistic Features and Peripatus 68

XII. Athens, Argolid and Southern Italy 72

XIII. Metre 74

a. Dactyls and Spondees 75

b. Spondaic Fifth Foot 76

c. Main Caesura and Bucolic Diaeresis 77

d. Word-end in Other Positions 79
e. Pentameters 80
f. Prosodica 81

POETICAL FRAGMENTS (frr. 1–28) 85
Ἑρμῆς 85
Δημήτηρ 87
Τήλεφος? 92
Ἐπιγράμματα and Παίγνια 92
Fragmenta incertae sedis 93
Hermes 95
I. Commentary (frr. 1–5) 95
IIa. Parthenius *Erot. path. 2* and Philitas *Hermes* 126
IIb. Title and Content 131
IIc. Influence 137
Demeter 142
I. Commentary (frr. 5a–21) 142
II. Reconstruction of *Demeter* 223
III. Influence of *Demeter* 244
a. Theocritus 7 244
b1. Callimachus, *Hymn to Apollo* 273
b2. Callimachus, *Hymn to Demeter* 293
c. Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* 299
d. Nicander 303
e. Philicus, *Hymn to Demeter* 307
Telephus (?, fr. 22) 309
Epigrams and Paegnia 313
I. Commentary (frr. 23–25) 313
II. Philitas' Epigrams Collection 327
Fragmenta incertae sedis 329
Commentary (frr. 26–28) 329
Alleged Poetical Ascriptions 335

GRAMMATICAL FRAGMENTS (FRR. 29–56) 347
Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι and Ἑρμηνεία 347
Ataktoi Glossai and *Hermeneia* 356
I. Commentary (frr. 29–58) 356
II. Title, Content and Form of *Ataktoi Glossai* 384
III. Sources 388
IV. Range and Methods 390

V. *Hermeneia*, Homeric Studies 392
VI. Influence, Survival 396
Alleged Grammatical Ascriptions 401

APPENDICES
I. Four Verse Citations in Hesychius 405
II. A New Epic Fragment? 408
III. A Hypothesis on *Soros* 409

INDICES
Ia. Index verborum of the Poetical Fragments 411
Ib. Index verborum of the Grammatical Fragments 414
IIa. Index fontium of the Poetical Fragments 415
IIb. Index fontium of the Grammatical Fragments 416
IIc. Index fontium of the Testimonia 418
III. Index of Passages Discussed 420
IV. General Index 431
V. Index of Greek Words, Phrases or Terms Discussed 446

CONCORDANCES 451

PREFACE

There is no such book as does not contain any mistakes or omissions and mine does not claim to be an exception. However, books are meant to become *publici iuris* and in the end I decided to let it go. This book started in October 1993 as a St Andrews PhD, which was concluded and approved in January 1997, but which contained only the poetical fragments, and it soon became clear that there was still a lot to be done on them, as well as studying the *Ataktoi Glossai* and the *Testimonia*. That research was carried out in Rethymno (Crete). At different periods of time I enjoyed access to the Bodleian and Ashmolean Libraries in Oxford as well as to the Blegen Library of the American Archaeological Institute in Athens.

Philitas is a key-figure, who is important for us as the first scholar and poet and as the person who conceived the ideals that Callimachus so staunchly defended. His affinities with Callimachus are remarkable in many respects. Regrettably, he has been essentially obliterated, so that the influence of his work, rather than the work itself, gains particular importance. In the case of *Demeter* this will help offer a new perspective on many passages which convey images with which the learned poets expressed their literary credo. Some readers may be dismayed at the bold treatment of that chapter. Nevertheless, from a certain point onwards the cataclysm of coincidences led me to believe that they can not be merely coincidental. I am well aware of the fact that the subject is not exhausted and others may like to continue working on it, including aspects of the very same poems treated there. I would only like to point out to advocates of direct Philitan influence on the Romans to first search — and search well — in Callimachus and Theocritus before crossing the bridge to Propertius, Ovid or Longus.

It is a pleasure to record my gratefulness to different people who provided help with comments, dispatch of copies of books and articles which were not easily accessible, and encouragement. Notably, to Dr Jane Lightfoot (Oxford), Dr Barbara Spinoula (St Andrews), Prof. Theodoros Stephanopoulos (Patras), Prof. Christos Theodoridis (Thessaloniki) and the Brill anonymous reader. I am profoundly grateful to Prof. Guido Bastianini (Florence), who kindly supplied

the text of Posidippus test. 3 before its publication and to Mr Adrian Hollis and Prof. Luigi Lehnus for mediating my request to him. My thanks also go to Dr Dionysios Kalamakis (Athens) who provided lemmata from the third volume (γ–ε) of the late Prof. Livadaras' edition of EtG/EtM prior to its publication. The examiners of what was a PhD, Prof. Stephen Halliwell (St Andrews) and Mr Adrian Hollis (Oxford) made numerous improvements and suggestions. Above all, I owe gratitude to Dr Malcolm Campbell. His knowledge of epic poetry and his readiness to share it with others are remarkable. He encouraged me to work on Philitas, supervised my research at all stages and was never too tired to discuss passages, answer queries and not least lend items from his exceptional depository of rare books and articles. Moreover, he and Mr Hollis allowed me to make use of their unpublished notes on Philitas (for them Philetas), which are indicated by prefixing an asterisk (*) before their names. I regret the fact that E. Dettori, *Filita grammatico. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Rome 2000 and L. Sbardella, *Filita. Testimonianze e frammenti poetici* (forthcoming) appeared too late for me to make use of them. Lastly, it would be an unforgivable omission not to record my indebtedness to the example of my teacher *par excellence* in Crete, the late Jean Kambitsis. His memory has never ceased to be a source of inspiration.

The book is dedicated to Leonidas and Epistimi, my parents: without their support none of this would have been possible.

Rethymno, February 2001.

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. *Ancient Authors and Texts*

A.I. *Editions of Philitas*

In the *apparatus criticus* these are referred to by the name of the editor alone.

R. F. P. Brunck, *Analecta veterum poetarum graecorum* ii, 523f. and iii, 234f., Strasbourg 1776.
C. Ph. Kayser, *Philetae Coi fragmenta quae reperiuntur*, Göttingen 1793.
F. Jacobs, *Anthologia Graeca sive poetarum graecorum lusus* i, Leipzig 1794, 121f.
W. E. Weber, *Die elegische Dichter der Hellenen*, Frankfurt 1826, 272f.
N. Bach, *Philetae Coi, Hermesianactis atque Phanoclis reliquiae*, Halle 1829, 1f.
F. W. Schneidewin, *Delectus poetarum elegiacorum graecorum* i, Göttingen 1838, 142f.
J. A. Hartung, *Die griechischen Elegiker* ii, Leipzig 1859, 28f.
Th. Bergk, *Anthologia Lyrica graeca* ii, Leipzig ^{2}1868, 131f.
J. U. Powell [see A.II *CA*], 90f.
A. Nowacki, *Philitae Coi fragmenta poetica*, Diss. Münster 1927.
G. Kuchenmüller, *Philetae Coi reliquiae*, Diss. Berlin 1928.
E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* ii, Leipzig 1925, 209f. (Leipzig ^{2}1942, fasc. vi, 49f.).
A. S. F. Gow – D. L. Page [see A.II *HE*] i, 165.
H. Lloyd-Jones – P. J. Parsons [see A.II *SH*], 318f.

A.II. *Collections of texts*

In the references to inscriptions the location is stated only when it makes a point. Names of cities are in English in all sections of the book.

AVI — W. Peek, *Attische Versinschriften*, Leipzig 1980.
CA — J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford 1925.
CEG — P. A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, Berlin-N.Y. 1983–.
Cougny — E. Cougny, *Anthologia Palatina* ed. F. Didot, vol. iii *Appendix*, Paris 1890.
CPG — E. L. von Leutsch – F. G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, Göttingen 1839–1851.
D-K — H. Diels – W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin ^{4}1952.
EG. . Kaibel — G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin 1878.
EGF — M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1988.
FGE — D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge 1981.
FGrH — F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, parts I–III, Berlin-Leiden 1923–1958. G. Schepens (ed.), parts IV–, Leiden 1998–.

GDRK E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Göttingen ²1963/1964.
GES J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*, Leipzig 1972.
GPh A. S. F. Gow – D. L. Page, *The Garland of Philip and some contemporary Epigrams*, Cambridge 1968.
GVI W. Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften* i: *Grabepigramme*, Berlin 1955.
GVICyr W. Peek, *Griechische Versinschriften aus der Cyrenaica und Mauritanien und Numidien*, Berlin 1972.
HE A. S. F. Gow – D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965.
HG R. Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos*, Berlin 1928.
IdC M. Segre, *Inscrizioni di Cos*, Rome 1993.
IEG M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, Oxford ²1989/²1992.
IMEG E. Bernand, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, Paris 1969.
LSAM F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1955.
LSCG F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969.
LSS Supplement to the above (Paris 1962).
OrphF O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, Berlin 1922.
PCG R. Kassel – C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci*, Berlin-N.Y. 1983–.
PEG A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci*, Leipzig 1987, ed. corr. 1996–.
PG J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus*, series Graeca, Paris 1844–1866.
PGR A. Giannini, *Paradoxographorum Graecorum reliquiae*, Milan 1966.
PMG D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962.
PMGF M. Davies, *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Oxford 1991–.
P-W H. W. Parke – D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* ii: *The Oracular Responses*, Oxford 1956.
SEG H. W. Pleket, R. S. Stoud, *al.*, *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, new series, Amsterdam 1976/7–.
SH H. Lloyd-Jones – P. J. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin-N.Y. 1983.
SLG D. L. Page, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, Oxford 1974.
Suppl. Mag. R. W. Daniel – F. Maltomini, *Supplementum Magicum*, Cologne-Opladen 1990.
TrGF B. Snell, *al.*, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen 1971 (²1986)–.

A.III. *Other fragments or collections*

This section includes only collections of poems or fragments, references to which are not indicated ad hoc.

Aeschylus S. Radt, *TrGF* iii (1985).
Anacreontea M. L. West, *Carmina Anacreontea*, Leipzig 1984, ed. corr. 1993.
Antimachus Matthews [see B.III].

Aristophanes	R. Kassel – C. Austin, *PCG* iii.2 (1984).
Aristophanes Byz.	W. J. Slater, *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Berlin-N.Y. 1986.
Aristotle	V. Rose, *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1886, *id.*, *Aristoteles pseudepigraphus*, Leipzig 1863.
Bacchylides	H. Maehler, *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis*, Leipzig 2000.
Bion, Moschus, Theocritus	A. S. F. Gow, *Bucolici Graeci*, OCT ^{2}1958.
Callimachus	Pfeiffer, Hollis (for *Hecale*) [see B.III], text for *Aetia* i + ii from *SH* and Massimilla [see B.III], numbering from *SH* and Pfeiffer.
Claudian *Gig.*	J. B. Hall, *Claudii Claudiani Carmina*, Leipzig 1985.
Dionysius Bass.	E. Livrea, *Dionysii Bassaricon et Gigantiadis Fragmenta*, Rome 1973.
Epicharmus/Sophron	R. Kassel – C. Austin, *PCG* i (2001).
Euripides	A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Leipzig ^{2}1889, with Supplement by B. Snell, Hildesheim 1964 (unless otherwise stated).
Hesiod	R. Merkelbach – M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodea*, Oxford 1967 and *idd.*, *Hesiodi Fragmenta selecta*, OCT ^{3}1990.
Machon	A. S. F. Gow, *Machon. The Fragments*, Cambridge 1965.
Men. (*Mon.*, *Sent.*, *Comp. Men. et Phil.*)	S. Jäkel, *Menandri Sententiae, Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis*, Leipzig 1964.
Neoptolemus of Parion	Poetical fragments as in *CA*, other fragments as in H. J. Mette, "Neoptolemos von Parion", *RhM* n.s. 123 (1980), 1–24.
Nicander	Schneider 1856 [see B.III].
Orphic *Hymns*	W. Quandt, *Orphei Hymni*, Berlin ^{3}1962.
Pamprepius	E. Livrea, *Pamprepii Panopolitani Carmina*, Leipzig 1979.
Peripatetics	Wehrli [see B.III].
Pindar	H. Maehler, *Pindari Carmina* ii: *Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1989.
Salmakis epigram	S. Isager, "The pride of Halikarnassos", *ZPE* 123 (1998), 1–23 [re-edited in R. Merkelbach – J. Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten* i, Stuttgart 1998, 39–45].
Sappho & Alcaeus	E. M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta*, Amsterdam 1971.
Sophocles	S. Radt, *TrGF* iv (1977).
Theon	Guhl [see B.III].

A.IV. *Editions of ancient lexica*

The sigla appearing in this edition, are identical to those employed in the editions of this section (so e.g. cod. Dorvillianus Bodl. xi.1.1.2 of EtM (15th cent.) appears as D when a reference is sourced from Gaisford, but as O when from Lassere-Livadaras). Only works references to which are not indicated ad hoc, are mentioned here.

Apoll. Soph.	I. Bekker, *Apollonii Sophistae lexicon Homericum*, Berlin 1833.
EtG (EtSym.)	F. Lassere – N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum magnum genuinum, Symeonis etymologicum una cum magna grammatica, Etymologicum magnum auctum*, Rome 1976/Athens 1992 (α–β). Lemmata γ–ε from Livadaras' third volume are always followed by L. The remaining letters as indicated ad hoc.
EtM	F. Lassere – N. Livadaras, *op.c.* (α–β), Th. Gaisford, *Etymologicum magnum*, Oxford 1848 (γ–ω). For lemmata γ–ε from Livadaras see above.
Hesychius	K. Latte, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, Copenhagen 1953/1966 (α–o), M. Schmidt, *Ἡσυχίου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως Λεξικόν* iii/iv, Halle 1861/1862 (π–ω).
Moeris	D. U. Hansen, *Das attizistische Lexicon des Moeris*, Berlin-N.Y. 1998.
Orion Theb.	F. W. Sturz, *Orionis Thebani Etymologicon*, Leipzig 1820.
Phot. *Lex.*	Chr. Theodoridis, *Photii patriarchi lexicon*, Berlin-N.Y. 1982/1998 (α–μ), R. Porson, *Φωτίου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Λεξικόν* e codice Galeano descriptus, ed. P. P. Dobree, London 1822 (ν–ω).
Pollux	E. Bethe, *Pollucis onomasticon*, Leipzig 1900/1931 (*Index* 1937).
Steph. Byz.	A. Meineke, *Stephani Byzantinii Ethnicorum quae supersunt*, Berlin 1849.
Suidas (Suda)	A. Adler, *Suidae lexicon*, Leipzig 1928–1938.
'Zonaras'	J. A. H. Tittmann, *Ioannis Zonarae lexicon*, Leipzig 1808.

B. *Modern Works*

B.I. *Grammars, lexica and basic works of reference*

AH	F. Matz – H. G. Buchholtz (edd.), *Archaeologia Homerica*, Göttingen 1967–.
ANRW	H. Temporini – W. Haase (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin-N.Y. 1972–.
B-P	C. D. Buck – W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*, Chicago 1945.
Chantraine *DE*	P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968–1980.
id. GH	P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, Paris 1958/1963.
Denniston	J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*, Oxford [2]1954.
DGE	F. R. Adrados, *al., Diccionario Griego-Español*, Madrid 1980–.

Ebeling	H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, Leipzig 1880/1885.
Frisk	H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1954–1972.
K-G	R. Kühner – B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* ii: *Satzlehre*, Hanover-Leipzig 1898/1904.
KlP	K. Ziegler – W. Sontheimer (edd.), *Der Kleine Pauly: Lexikon der Antike*, Stuttgart 1964–1975.
KWH	H. H. Schmitt – E. Vogt (edd.), *Kleines Wörterbuch des Hellenismus*, Wiesbaden ^{2}1993.
LFrE	B. Snell, H. Erbse, *al.* (edd.), *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, Göttingen 1955–.
LGPN	P. M. Fraser, *al.*, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford 1987–.
LIMC	H. C. Ackermann – J. R. Gisler (edd.), *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zurich-Düsseldorf 1981–1997.
LSJ	H. G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford ^{9}1940.
LSJ Suppl.	P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *LSJ Revised Supplement*, Oxford 1996.
LVG	P. Radici-Collace (ed.), *Lexicon Vasorum Graecorum*, Pisa 1992–.
DNP	H. Cancik – H. Schneider (edd.), *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, Stuttgart-Weimar 1996–.
^{3}*OCD*	S. Hornblower – A. Spawforth (edd.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford ^{3}1996.
OLD	P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1982.
RE	G. Wissowa, *al.* (edd.), *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart-Munich 1893–1978.
RE Suppl.	Supplements to the above.
Roscher	W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig 1884–1937.
Schwyzer	E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, Munich 1939/1950.
Threatte	L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, Berlin-N.Y. 1980–.
Windekens	A. J. van Windekens, *Dictionnaire étymologique complémentaire de la langue grecque*, Leeven-Paris 1986.

B.II. *Abbreviations of names of authors or editors*

G-P	A. S. F. Gow – D. L. Page
K-A	R. Kassel – C. Austin
Ll-J	H. Lloyd-Jones
N-H	R. G. M. Nisbet – M. Hubbard
Wil.	U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff

B.III. *Other works*

This section embraces books or articles mentioned more than once (with a few exceptions). Of commentaries only those are listed, to which references have been made according to page number. In case of books translated into English the place and date of the original publication are given in brackets.

A-H-S — T. W. Allen – W. R. Halliday – E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns*, Oxford 1936.
Alexiou — M. Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Cambridge 1974.
Alfonsi 1943 — L. Alfonsi, "La Poesia Amorosa di Filita", *Aegyptus* 23 (1943), 160–8 [= "Die Liebesdichtung des Philitas" in Pfohl 422–33].
id. 1954 — L. Alfonsi, "Un frammento di Filita", *Aegyptus* 34 (1954), 211–4.
Allen — A. Allen, *The Fragments of Mimnermus*, Stuttgart 1993.
Aly — W. Aly – F. Sbordone, *De Strabonis codice rescripto*, City of Vatican 1956.
Arnott 1979 — W. G. Arnott, "The Mound of Brasilas in Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*", *QUCC* n.s. 33 (1979), 99–106.
id. 1984 — W. G. Arnott, "Lycidas and Double Perspectives: A Discussion of Theocritus' Seventh Idyll", *EClás* 26 (1984), 333–46.
id. 1996 — W. G. Arnott, *Alexis: The Fragments. A Commentary*, Cambridge 1996.
Asper — M. Asper, *Onomata Allotria. Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*, Stuttgart 1997.
Barber, ²*OCD* — E. A. Barber in N. G. L. Hammond – H. H. Scullard (edd.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford ²1970, 814 s.v. Philetas.
Barth — H.-L. Barth, *Die Fragmente aus den Schriften des Grammatikers Kallistratos zu Homers Ilias und Odyssee*, Bonn 1984.
Bing 1986 — P. Bing, "The Alder and the poet", *RhM* n.s. 129 (1986), 222–6.
id. 1988 — P. Bing, *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Göttingen 1988.
Blech — M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin-N.Y. 1982.
Blümner — H. Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, Leipzig 1875–7 (i ²1912).
Bodson — L. Bodson, *Hiera zôia: contribution à l'étude de la place de l'animal dans la religion grecque ancienne*, Brussels 1978.
Bonaldi — A. Z. Bonaldi, "Note filetee", *BIFG* 3 (1976), 264–80.
Bornmann — F. Bornmann, *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam*, Florence 1968.
Boucher — J. P. Boucher, *Études sur Properce*, Paris ²1980.
Bowie — E. L. Bowie, "Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus", *CQ* n.s. 35 (1985), 67–91.
Bremmer 1983 — J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of Soul*, Princeton 1983.
id. 1994 — J. N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion*, Oxford 1994.
Brommer — F. Brommer, *Odysseus*, Darmstadt 1983.
Bulloch — A. W. Bulloch, *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*, Cambridge 1985.
Burkert 1983 — W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, Berkeley-L.A.-London 1983 (Berlin-N.Y. 1972, ²1996).
id. 1985 — W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, Oxford 1985 (Stuttgart 1977).

Butler-Barber	H. E. Butler – E. A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius*, Oxford 1933.
Byl	S. Byl, *Recherches sur les grandes traités biologiques d'Aristote*, Brussels 1980.
Cairns 1979	F. Cairns, *Tibullus. A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge 1979.
Cairns 1993	D. L. Cairns, *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek literature*, Oxford 1993.
Calderon	E. Calderon, "Filetas de Cos, poeta doctus: las coordenadas de una época", *EClás* 30 (1988), 7–34.
Cambiano	G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza (edd.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* i.2, Rome 1993.
Cameron 1991	Alan Cameron, "How Thin was Philetas?", *CQ* n.s. 41 (1991), 534–8 [= "Thin Gentlemen" in *id.* 1995, 488–93].
id. 1993	Alan Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993.
id. 1995	Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton 1995.
*Campbell	M. Campbell, "Philetas' *Telephus* and *Res Argonauticae*" (unpublished, given to me *privatim* in February 1995).
id. 1981	M. Campbell, *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*, Leiden 1981.
id. 1983	M. Campbell, *Studies in the Third Book of Apollonius Rhodius'* Argonautica, Hildesheim 1983.
id. 1994	M. Campbell, *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius* Argonautica *III 1–471*, Leiden 1994.
Caswell	C. P. Caswell, *A Study of* thymos *in Early Greek Epic*, Leiden 1990.
Casevitz	M. Casevitz (ed.), *Études homériques*, Lyon 1989.
Cataudella	Q. Cataudella, "Hellenistica", *Helikon* 7 (1967), 402–4 [= *Interno al Lirici Greci*, Rome 1972, 191–5].
Cazzaniga	I. Cazzaniga, "Un epigramma di Fileta", *RFIC* 40 (1962), 238–48.
Cessi 1908	C. Cessi, "De Philitae carminibus quaestiones", *Eranos* 8 (1908), 117–43.
id. 1914	C. Cessi, "Sul 'Telefo' di Filita", *RIFC* 42 (1914), 283–8.
Chamoux	F. Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades*, Paris 1953.
Chantraine 1933	P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris 1933.
Christ-Schmid-Stählin	W. Christ – W. Schmid – O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf die Zeit Justinians* II.1, Munich ^{5}1920.
Clausen 1976	W. V. Clausen, "Virgil and Parthenius", *HSCP* 80 (1976), 179.
id. 1987	W. V. Clausen, *Virgil's* Aeneid *and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*, Berkeley 1987.
Cook	A. B. Cook, "The bee in Greek Mythology", *JHS* 15 (1895), 1–24.

Couat	A. Couat, *Alexandrian Poetry under the first three Ptolemies*, London 1931 (Paris 1882).
Craik	E. Craik, *The Dorian Aegean*, London 1980.
Crönert	W. Crönert, "Philitas von Kos", *Hermes* 73 (1902), 212–27.
Curty	O. Curty, *Les parentés legendaires entre cités grecques*, Genève 1995.
Davies-Kathirithamby	M. Davies – J. Kathirithamby, *Greek Insects*, London 1986.
Day	A. A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love Elegy*, Oxford 1938.
Deubner	L. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, Berlin 1932, rev. by B. Doer, Hildesheim ²1966.
Dover	K. Dover, *Theocritus: Select Poems*, London 1971.
Düntzer	H. Düntzer, *De Zenodoti studiis homericis*, Göttingen 1848.
Easterling-Knox	P. E. Easterling – B. M. W. Knox (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* i: *Greek Literature*, Cambridge 1985.
Edwards	M. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary V: books 17–20*, Cambridge 1991.
Effe	B. Effe (ed.), *Theokrit und die griechische Bukolik*, Darmstadt 1986.
Elliger	W. Elliger, *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung*, Berlin 1975.
Erbse 1986	H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos*, Berlin-N.Y. 1986.
id. Schol. Il.	H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca ad Homeri Iliadem*, Berlin 1969–1988.
F-G	E. Fernández-Galiano, *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey*: books XIX–XXII*, Oxford 1992.
Fantuzzi-Pretagostini	M. Fantuzzi – R. Pretagostini (edd.), *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, Rome 1995.
Farnell	L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford 1896–1909.
Fehling 1969	D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungen und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*, Berlin 1969.
id. 1972	D. Fehling, "Erysichthon oder das Märchen von der mündlichen Überlieferung", *RhM* n.s. 115 (1972), 173–96.
Förster	R. Förster, *Der Raub und die Rückkehr der Persephone*, Stuttgart 1874.
Foley	H. P. Foley, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Princeton 1994.
Fränkel	H. Fränkel, *De Simia Rhodio*, Diss. Göttingen 1915.
Fraser	P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford 1972.
Garland	R. Garland, *The Greek Way of Death*, London 1985.

Gennadios — P. G. Gennadios, *Φυτολογικὸν Λεξικόν*, Athens 1914.

Ginouvès — R. Ginouvès, *Balaneutiké. Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*, Paris 1962.

Gow — A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus*, Cambridge ²1952.

Gow-Scholfield — A. S. F. Gow – A. F. Scholfield, *Nicander*, Cambridge 1952.

Groningen — B. A. van Groningen, *Euphorion*, Amsterdam 1977.

Guhl — C. Guhl, *Die Fragmente des Alexandrinischen Grammatikers Theon*, Diss. Hamburg 1969.

Gutzwiller 1991 — K. Gutzwiller, *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies*, Wisconsin 1991.

id. 1998 — K. J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1998.

Hägg — R. Hägg, *al.* (edd.), *Early Greek Cult Practice*, Stockholm 1988.

Hainsworth — J. B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary III: books 9–12*, Cambridge 1993.

Hallof – Habicht — L. and K. Hallof – Chr. Habicht, "Aus der Arbeit der 'Inscriptiones Graecae'. Ehrendekrete aus dem Asklepieion von Kos", *Chiron* 28 (1998), 101–42.

Harder 1993 — M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker (edd.), *Hellenistica Groningana* i: *Callimachus*, Groningen 1993.

id. 1996 — M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker (edd.), *Hellenistica Groningana* ii: *Theocritus*, Groningen 1996.

Hardie — A. Hardie, "Philitas and the Plane tree", *ZPE* 119 (1997), 21–36.

Heinze — R. Heinze, *Virgil's Epic Technique*, London 1993 (Berlin-Leipzig ³1915).

Herzog — R. Herzog, *Koische Forschungen und Funde*, Leipzig 1899.

Heyworth — S. J. Heyworth, "Notes on Propertius, books III and IV", *CQ* n.s. 36 (1986), 199–211.

Hinds — S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-conscious Muse*, Cambridge 1987.

Hoffmann — O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum*, Göttingen 1906.

Höghammar — K. Höghammar, *Sculpture and Society: A Study of the Connection between the Free-standing Sculpture and Society in Cos in the Hellenistic and Augustan Periods*, Uppsala 1993.

*A. S. Hollis — Unpublished handwritten notes on the author's PhD, given to me *privatim* in January 1997.

id. 1978 — A. S. Hollis, "Callimachus, *Aetia* fr. 1.9–12", *CQ* n.s. 28 (1978), 402–6.

id. 1990 — A. S. Hollis, *Callimachus, Hecale*, Oxford 1990.

id. 1996 — A. S. Hollis, "Heroic Honours for Philetas?", *ZPE* 110 (1996), 56–62.

id. 1998 — A. S. Hollis, "Some Neglected Verse Citations in Hesychius", *ZPE* 123 (1998), 61–71.

Hopkinson 1984 — N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*, Cambridge 1984.

id. 1994 — N. Hopkinson, *Greek Poetry from the Imperial Period*, Cambridge 1994.

Hubaux — J. Hubaux, "Le dieu Amour chez Properce et chez Longus", *BAB* 39 (1953), 263–70.

Hunt-Johnson — A. S. Hunt – J. Johnson, *Two Theocritus Papyri*, London 1930.

Hunter 1983 — R. L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe*, Cambridge 1983.

id. 1993 — R. L. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*, Cambridge 1993.

id. 1996 — R. L. Hunter, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge 1996.

id. 1999 — R. L. Hunter, *Theocritus: A Selection*, Cambridge 1999.

Hutchinson — G. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford 1988.

Janko — R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary IV: books 13–16*, Cambridge 1992.

Kabus-Preißhofen — R. Kabus-Preißhofen, *Die hellenistische Plastik der Insel Kos*, Berlin 1989.

Kambylis — A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik*, Heidelberg 1965.

Kidd — D. A. Kidd, *Aratus, Phaenomena*, Cambridge 1997.

Knox — P. E. Knox, "Philetas and Roman Poetry", *PLILS* 7 (1993), 61–83.

Körte-Händel — A. Körte – P. Händel, *Die hellenistische Dichtung*, Stuttgart ²1960.

Koukoules — Ph. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν Βίος καὶ Πολιτισμός*, Athens 1948–1952.

Kühn — H.-J. Kühn, "Die Thalysien Theokrits (id. 7)", *Hermes* 86 (1958), 40–79.

Kuiper — K. Kuiper, "De Philetae Coi Mercurio" in *Album gratulorium in honorem van Herwerdeni*, Maastricht 1902, 143–9.

Kyriakou — P. Kyriakou, *Homeric* hapax legomena *in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius*, Stuttgart 1995.

La Penna — A. La Penna, "'*Ipse Coo plaudente Philitas*' (Stat. *Silv.* 1, 2, 252): Un'ipotesi su Fileta di Cos", *RFIC* 116 (1988), 318–20.

Lapp — F. Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei tropis et figuris*, Diss. Bonn 1965.

Latacz 1985 — J. Latacz, "Das Plappermäulchen aus dem Katalog" in *Catalepton. Festschrift für B. Wyss*, Basle 1985, 77–95 [= *Erschließung der Antike. Kleine Schriften zur Literatur der Griechen und Römer*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994, 427–46].

id. 1999 — J. Latacz, "Philitas und Homer. Bemerkungen zu Philitas' *Hermes*" in J. N. Kazazis – A. Rengakos (edd.), *Euphrosyne. Studies . . . D. N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart 1999, 202–210.

Latte *Kl. Schr.* K. Latte, *Kleine Schriften*, edd. O. Gigon, *al.*, Munich 1968.

Lattimore R. Lattimore, *Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana [2]1962.

Lausberg M. Lausberg, *Das Einzeldistichon. Studien zum antiken Epigramm*, Munich 1982.

Lawall G. Lawall, *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals*, Washington 1967.

Lefkowitz M. L. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London 1981.

Legrand Ph. E. Legrand, *Étude sur Theocrite*, Paris 1898.

Lehrs K. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi studiis homericis*, Leipzig [3]1882.

Lembach K. Lembach, *Die Pflanzen bei Theokrit*, Heidelberg 1970.

Leumann 1950 M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, Basle 1950.

id. Kl. Schr. M. Leumann, *Kleine Schriften*, edd. H. Haffer, E. Risch, W. Rüegg, Zurich-Stuttgart 1959.

Lightfoot J. L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea*, Oxford 1999.

Lilja S. Lilja, *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity*, Helsinki 1972.

Ll-J H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Academic Papers*, Oxford 1990.

Ludwich A. Ludwich, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik*, Leipzig 1884/1885.

Maas *Kl. Schr.* P. Maas, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. W. Buchwald, Munich 1973.

Maass 1894 E. Maass, "Commentatio Mythographica ii", *Index Schol. Gryphiswald* (1894).

id. 1895a E. Maass, *De tribus Philetae carminibus*, Marburg 1895.

id. 1895b E. Maass, *Orpheus*, Munich 1895.

McKay 1962 K. J. McKay, *Erysichthon. A Callimachean Comedy*, Leiden 1962.

id. 1978 K. J. McKay, "A lost work of Philetas?", *Antichthon* 12 (1978), 36–44.

McNamee K. McNamee, "The Long and the Short of Callimachus *Aetia* fr. 1,9–12", *BASP* 19 (1982), 83–6.

Magnelli E. Magnelli, *Alexandri Aetoli Testimonia et Fragmenta*, Florence 1999.

Massimilla G. Massimilla, *Callimaco,* Aitia. *Libri primo e secondo*, Pisa 1996.

Masson O. Masson, *Onomastica Graeca Selecta*, Paris 1992.

Matthews V. J. Matthews, *Antimachus of Colophon*, Leiden 1996.

Meiggs R. Meiggs, *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Meditteranean World*, Oxford 1982.

Meineke A. Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina*, Berlin 1843.

Mélanges Taillardat *ΗΔΙΣΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΔΕΙΠΝΟΝ. Logopédies: mélanges de Philologie et de Linguistique grecques offerts à Jean Taillardat*, Paris 1988.

Merkelbach R. Merkelbach, *APF* 16 (1956), 115–7 [= *Philologica. Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997, 83–6].

Meyer E. Meyer, *RE* XX.1 (1941), 269–90 s.v. Phleious.

Mineur W. H. Mineur, *Callimachus, Hymn to Delos*, Leiden 1984.

Montanari F. Montanari (ed.), *La philologie grecque à l'epoque hellenistique et romaine* (Entr. Fond. Hardt 40), Vandœuvres-Genève 1994 [1993].

Müller 1987 C. W. Müller, *Erysichthon. Der Mythos als narrative Metapher im Demeterhymnos des Kallimachos*, Mainz 1987.

id. 1990 C. W. Müller, "Philetas oder Philitas?" in P. Steinmetz (ed.), *Beiträge zur hellenistischen Literatur und ihrer Rezeption in Rom*, Stuttgart 1990, 27–37.

Murr J. Murr, *Die Pflanzenwelt in der griechischen Mythologie*, Innsbruck 1890.

Mynors R. A. B. Mynors, *Virgil, Georgics*, Oxford 1990.

Nesselrath H. G. Nesselrath, *Die attische Mittlere Komödie: ihre Stellung in der antiken Literaturkritik und Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin-N.Y. 1990.

Nikitinski O. Nikitinski, *Kallimachos-Studien*, Frankfurt a.M. 1996.

Nilsson 1906 M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung*, Leipzig 1906.

id. 1967 M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* i, Munich [3]1967.

Nünlist R. Nünlist, *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998.

P-H W. R. Paton – E. L. Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos*, Oxford 1891.

Papanghelis Th. D. Papanghelis, *'Η Ποιητική τῶν 'Ρωμαίων 'Νεωτέρων'*, Athens 1994.

Parker 1983 R. Parker, *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford 1983.

id. 1996 R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History*, Oxford 1996.

Pearce T. E. V. Pearce, "The Function of the *Locus Amoenus* in Theocritus' Seventh Poem", *RhM* n.s. 113 (1988), 276–304.

Perpillou J.-L. Perpillou, *Recherches lexicales en grec ancien*, Louvain-Paris 1996.

Pfeiffer R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus*, Oxford 1949/1953.

id. 1968 R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.

Pfohl G. Pfohl (ed.), *Die griechische Elegie*, Darmstadt 1972.

Phytonymes *Actes du colloque international: "Les phytonymes grecs et latins"*, Nice 1993.

Pley J. Pley, *De lanae in antiquorum ritibus usu*, Gießen 1911.

Pöhlmann E. Pöhlmann, "Dichterweihe und Gattungswahl" in A. E. Radke (ed.), *Candide Judex. Festschrift für W. Wimmel*, Stuttgart 1998, 247–60.

Pohlenz M. Pohlenz, "Die hellenistische Poesie und die Philosophie" in *Kleine Schriften* ii, ed. H. Dörrie, Hildesheim 1965, 1–37 [= *Charites, F. Leo . . . dargebracht*, Berlin 1911, 76–112].

Puelma 1954 M. Puelma, "Die Vorbilder der Elegiendichtung in Alexandrien und Rom", *MH* 11 (1954), 101–16.

id. 1957 M. Puelma, "Philetas und Antimachos im Aitienprolog", *Philologus* 101 (1957), 90–100 [= *Labor et Lima*, Basle 1995, 172–88 with additions].

id. 1960 M. Puelma, "Die Dichterbegegnung in Theokrits 'Thalysien'", *MH* 17 (1960), 144–64 [= Effe 239–71 with additions].

Pusch — H. Pusch, *Quaestiones Zenodoteae*, Halle 1890.

Redard — G. Redard, *Les noms grecs en -της -τις*, Paris 1949.

Reece — S. Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*, Ann Arbor 1993.

Reitzenstein 1893 — R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, Leipzig 1893.

id. 1897 — R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologica*, Leipzig 1897.

Rengakos 1992 — A. Rengakos, "Homerische Wörter bei Kallimachos", *ZPE* 94 (1992), 21–47.

id. 1993 — A. Rengakos, *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*, Stuttgart 1993.

id. 1994 — A. Rengakos, *Apollonius Rhodius und die antike Homererklärung*, Munich 1994.

Rohde 1914 — E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig ³1914.

id. Kl. Schr. — E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften*, Tübingen-Leipzig 1901.

Richardson 1974 — N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford 1974.

id. 1993 — N. J. Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary VI: books 21–24*, Cambridge 1993.

Risch — E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin-N.Y. ²1974.

Robert-Tornow — W. Robert-Tornow, *De apium mellisque apud veteres significatione et symbolica et mythologica*, Berlin 1893.

Rostovtzeff — M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford 1941.

Sbardella — L. Sbardella, "L'opera 'sinora ignota' di Filita di Cos", *QUCC* n.s. 52 (1996), 93–119.

Schachter — A. Schachter (ed.), *Le sanctuaire grec* (Entr. Fond. Hardt 37), Vandœuvres-Genève 1992 [1990].

Scheibner — G. Scheibner, "Ein unbekanntes Philitasfragment in der Berliner Papyrussammlung" in F. Zucker (ed.), *Menanders Dyscolos als Zeugnis seiner Epoche*, Berlin 1965, 103–14.

Schmidt — M. Schmidt, *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias*, Munich 1976.

Schmitt — R. Schmitt, *Die Nominalbildung in den Dichtungen des Kallimachos von Kyrene*, Wiesbaden 1970.

Schneider 1856 — O. Schneider, *Nicandrea*, Leipzig 1856.

id. 1873 — O. Schneider, *Callimachea* ii: *Fragmenta*, Leipzig 1873.

Schönbeck — G. Schönbeck, *Der* locus amoenus *von Homer bis Horaz*, Diss. Heidelberg 1962.

Schoenemann — J. Schoenemann, *De lexicographis antiquis, qui rerum ordinem secuti sunt*, Diss. Bonn 1886.

Schweizer — H. Schweizer, *Aberglaube und Zauberei bei Theokrit*, Diss. Basle 1937.

Schwinge — E.-R. Schwinge, *Kunstlichkeit von Kunst: zur Geschichtlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie*, Munich 1986.

Seelbach	W. Seelbach, *Die Epigramme des Mnasalkes von Sikyon und des Theodoridas von Syrakus*, Wiesbaden 1964.
Segal	Ch. Segal, *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays on Theocritus and Virgil*, Princeton 1981.
Sh-W	S. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos. A Historical Survey from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period*, Göttingen 1978.
Slings	S. R. Slings, "Hermesianax and the Tattoo Elegy", *ZPE* 98 (1993), 29–37.
Sourvinou-Inwood	C. Sourvinou-Inwood, *"Reading" Greek Death*, Oxford 1995.
Spanoudakis 2000	K. Spanoudakis, "Hesychiana Minima", *ZPE* 130 (2000), 31–41.
id. 2001	K. Spanoudakis, "Poets and Telchines in Callimachus' *Aetia*- prologue", *Mnemosyne* iv 54 (2001), 425–441.
Stanford	W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*, Oxford ²1963, improved reprint 1968.
Studi Gigante	*Storia, poesia e pensiero nel mondo antico. Studi in onore di M. Gigante*, Naples 1994.
Sudhoff	K. Sudhoff, *Kos und Knidos*, Munich 1927.
Susemihl	F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandriner Zeit*, Leipzig 1891/1892.
Szádeczky-Kardoss	S. Szádeczky-Kardoss, "Ein Kapitel aus dem Nachleben des Mimnermos: Philetas und Mimnermos", *AAntHung* 16 (1968), 157–64.
Taillardat	J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane*, Paris 1965.
Thomas	R. F. Thomas, "The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virg., Georg. 4, 116–48", *MD* 29 (1992), 35–70.
Thompson 1936	D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A Lexicon of Greek Birds*, London ²1936.
id. 1947	D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A Lexicon of Greek Fishes*, London 1947.
Touchefeu-Meynier	O. Touchefeu-Meynier, *Thèmes odysséens dans l'art antique*, Paris 1968.
Trypanis	C. A. Trypanis, *Greek Poetry from Homer to Seferis*, London 1981.
van Straten	F. T. van Straten, *Hiera kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Leiden 1995.
Valk	M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, Leiden 1963/1964.
Vian	F. Vian, *Apollonios de Rhodes, Argonautiques*, i 1974 (ed. corr. 1976), ii ²1993, iii ²1996, Paris.
von Blumenthal	A. von Blumenthal, *RE* XIX.2 (1938), 2165–70 s.v. Philetas (1).
von Kamptz	H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personnennamen: sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*, Göttingen 1982.

Wächter — T. Wächter, *Reinheitsvorschriften im griechischen Kult*, Gießen 1910.

Weber — G. Weber, *Dichtung und höfische Gesselschaft: die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer*, Stuttgart 1993.

Webster — T. B. L. Webster, *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*, London 1964.

Wehrli — F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, 2nd ed. Basel 1967–1978.

Weingarth — G. Weingarth, *Zu Theokrits VII Idyll*, Diss. Freibourg 1967.

Wendel 1914 — C. Wendel, *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*, Leipzig 1914.

id. 1920 — C. Wendel, *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien*, Berlin 1920.

id. 1932 — C. Wendel, *Die Überlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos*, Berlin 1932.

West 1982 — M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982.

id. 1985 — M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, Oxford 1985.

id. 1992 — M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford 1992.

id., ed. *Il.* — M. L. West, *Homeri Ilias*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998/Munich-Leipzig 2000.

West 1988 — S. West, *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey: *books I–IV*, Oxford 1988.

Wil. 1881 — U. von Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, Berlin 1881.

id. 1884 — U. von Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin 1884.

id. 1886 — U. von Wilamowitz, *Isyllos von Epidauros*, Berlin 1886.

id. 1906 — U. von Wilamowitz, *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*, Berlin 1906.

id. 1912 — U. von Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, Berlin 1912.

id. 1924 — U. von Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, Berlin 1924.

id. 1931/32 — U. von Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, Berlin 1931/1932.

id. Kl. Schr. — U. von Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin 1935–1937.

Williams — F. Williams, "A Theophany in Theocritus", *CQ* n.s. 21 (1971), 137–45 [= Effe 271–85].

Wimmel 1958 — W. Wimmel, "Philetas im Aitienprolog des Kallimachos", *Hermes* 86 (1958), 346–54.

id. 1960 — W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom: die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*, Wiesbaden 1960.

Wyss — B. Wyss, *Antimachi Colophonii reliquiae*, Berlin 1936.

Zanker 1980 — G. Zanker, "Simichidas' walk and the locality of Bourina in Theoc. id. 7", *CQ* n.s. 31 (1980), 373–7.

id. 1987 — G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry*, London 1987.

Zanker 1996 — P. Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates. The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*, Berkeley-L.A.-Oxford 1996.

Zgusta — L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*, Heidelberg 1984.

Ziegler — K. Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos*, Berlin ^{2}1966.

C. *Other abbreviations*

Abbreviations of periodicals are identical to *L'année philologique.* Abbreviations of authors are either identical to, or more explicit than those employed in *LSJ* or *OLD.* "Theogn." comprises both Theognis and the *Theognidea.* References to modern collections regarding texts by other authors quoted in the same sources preserving fragments of P., are placed in brackets ( ) when the text is quoted, in square brackets [ ] when not quoted. Note that "quoted/see above/ff." always refer to the discussion preceding the commentary in the fragment they occur.

al.	*alii* or *aliter*
c.	*circa*
cap.	*caput*
HH	Homeric Hymn
l.l.	*loco laudato*
l.s.	*loco sequenti*
m.	mid-
P.	Philitas
q.v.	*quod/quem vide*
*	same sedes in the verse or root of a word
x	occurrences/anceps
>	the model of/leading to
<	derived from
. .	one word omitted
. . .	two or more words omitted
/. . ./	one verse omitted
[. . .]	two or more verses or substantial portion of a prose text omitted

TESTIMONIA

1. Suid. φ 332, IV.723.4 Adler (Hesychii Mil. epitomator)

Φιλητᾶς, Κῷος, υἱὸς Τηλέφου, ὢν ἐπί τε Φιλίππου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, γραμματικὸς κριτικός· ὃς ἰσχνωθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ ζητεῖν τὸν καλούμενον ψευδόμενον λόγον ἀπέθανεν. ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ διδάσκαλος τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου. ἔγραψεν ἐπιγράμματα, καὶ ἐλεγείας καὶ ἄλλα.

1 Φιλητας vario accentu codd., cf. T. 15 **2** γραμματικὸς <καὶ> κριτικός Toup cl. ε 359 κρητικός F | ἰσχνωθείς <ἐκ τοῦ ζητεῖν καὶ διώκειν ἀκίχητα> marg. add. M, post gl. V **4** ἐλεγεῖα F | <καὶ τὰ καλούμενα Ναξιακά> add. Eudocia, v. *All. Test.*, Perp. Propos. 3

2. Hermesian. *Leontion CA* 7.75–8 ap. Athen. 13.598e–f

οἶσθα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀοιδόν, ὃν Εὐρυπύλου πολιῆται
  Κῷοι χάλκειον θῆκαν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ
Βιττίδα μολπάζοντα θοήν, περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν
  ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλιήν.

75 τὸν A: corr. Casaubon **76** θῆκαν A: στῆσαν Hecker **77** Βιττίδα A: Βαττίδα Scaliger **78** ῥυόμενον A: corr. Hermann

3. Posid., PMil. Vogl. 309, inv. 1295.x.16–25, pap. saec. p.C. III *ex.*, edd. G. Bastianini – C. Gallazzi, *Posidippo di Pella. Epigrammi*, Milan 2001, 75

τόνδε Φιλίτα̣ χ[αλ]κ̣ὸν̣ [ἴ]σ̣ον̣ κ̣ατὰ πάνθ' Ἑκ[α]τ̣αῖος
  ἀ]κ̣[ρ]ι̣βὴς ἄκρους [ἔπλ]α̣σ̣εν εἰς ὄνυχας,
καὶ με]γέθει κα̣[ὶ σα]ρ̣κὶ τὸν ἀνθρωπιστὶ διώξας
  – ⏑]ν, ἀφ' ἡρώων δ' οὐ̣δὲν ἔμειξ' ἰδέης,
ἀ̣λλὰ τὸν ἀκρομέριμ̣νον ὅλ̣[ῃ κ]α̣τεμάξατο τέχνῃ
  πρ]ε̣σβυν, ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν̣ [ἔχων] κ̣ανόνα·
αὐδήσ]οντι δ' ἔοικ̣ε̣ν̣, ὅσῳ π̣ο̣ι̣κ̣ίλλεται ἤθει,
  – ⏓]ο̣ς, καίπερ χάλκεος ἐὼν ὁ γέρων·
ἐκ Πτολε]μ̣αίου δ' ὧδε θεοῦ θ' ἅμα καὶ βασιλῆος
  ἄγκειτ]α̣ι Μουσέων εἵνεκα Κῷος ἀνήρ.

Epigramma inter ἀνδριαν̣τ̣ο̣ποι̣ι̣κά no 9 **1** πανταεκ̣[.]ταιος Pap. **4** γνώμο]ν' e.g. suppl. edd. | εμειξειδεης Pap. **8** ἔμψυχ]ο̣ς e.g. suppl. edd. **9** suppl. J. Gascon | βασιλειος Pap. **10** μουσειων Pap.

4. Strato *Phoinikides PCG* 1.40–6 ap. Athen. 9.383a–b + PCair. 65445, pap. saec. a.C. III *ex.*, edd. O. Guéraud – P. Jouguet, *Un livre d'écolier*, Cairo 1938, 34

ἔθυεν, ἔλεγεν ἕτερα μυρία
τιοιˌαῦθˌ' ἅ, μὰ τὴν Γῆν, οὐδὲ εἷς συνῆκεν ἄν,
μίστυλλα, μοίρας, δίπτυχ', ὀβελούς· ὥστ' ἔδει
τὰ τοῦ Φιλίτα λαμβάνοντα βυβλία
σκοπεῖν ἕκαστον τί δύναται τῶν ῥημάτων.
ἀλλ' ἱκέτευον αὐτὸν ἤδη μεταβαλών
ἀνθρωπίνως λαλεῖν τι.

40 ετερα μυρια Pap.: ὥστε με A **41** συνηκεν αν Pap.: ἤκουσεν ἂν A **42** ωστ εδει Pap.: ὥστε με A **43** τα του Φιλιτα ... βυβλια Pap.: τῶν τοῦ φιλτα ... βιβλίων A **44** εκαστον Pap. (coniecerat Cobet): -α A | τῶν ῥημάτων A: τωμβυβλιων Pap. **45** αλλ ικετευον Pap.: πλὴν ἱκετεύω γ' A | μεταβαλων Pap.: -εῖν A **46** τι Pap.: τε A

5. Theoc. 7.39–41

οὐ γάρ πω κατ' ἐμὸν νόον οὔτε τὸν ἐσθλόν
Σικελίδαν νίκημι τὸν ἐκ Σάμω οὔτε Φιλήταν
ἀείδων, βάτραχος δὲ ποτ' ἀκρίδας ὥς τις ἐρίσδω.

40 Φιληταν vario accentu codd. (-ητᾶν plurr.)

6. Call. fr. 532

τῷ ἴκελον τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κώϊον

EtG (AB) ap. Reitzenstein 1897, 294.23 (EtSym. V, EtGud., EtM) Κῷος· σὺν τῷ ῑ γράφεται, ἐπειδὴ εὕρηται (<καὶ> Reitz.) κατὰ διάστασιν. Καλλίμαχος· 'τῷ — Κώϊον', ex Oro Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας ut vid. Cf. Prop. T. 23a.

7a. Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.9–12 ap. POxy. 2079, pap. saec. p.C. II, ed. A. S. Hunt (1927)

. . . . . .]γὰρ ἔηṿ [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος· ἀλλὰ καθέλˌκει
. . . . πολ̣ὺ̣ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρο̣[ς·
τοῖν δὲ] δ̣υ̣οῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, α[ἵ γ' ἁπαλαί τοι
. . . . . .] ἡ μ̣εγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή̣.

9 χὼ Κῷος] Luppe: Κῷος δὴ] Puelma: ἦ μὲν δὴ] Pfeiffer | ρεηṿ Pap., "fort. γὰ̣ρ̣ ἔηṿ" Lobel **10** δρῦν Housman: θεῦν Hollis, Matthews (at v. id. 45): γραῦν Gallavotti, Milne (γρηῦν vel γρεῦν Maas): Κῶν Vitelli ("brevius spatio" Pfeiffer, sed cf. Parsons ap. Hollis 1978, 402 adn. 1) **11** init. suppl. Housman | fin. suppl. e Σ Lond. 11 (coniecerat Luppe) **12** νήνιες] Luppe (an Nymphae?): κῶραι γ'] A. Allen: Κῷαι] Puelma

7b. Σ Florentina ad Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.9–12 ap. PSI 1219.i.12–5, pap. saec. p.C. II/III, edd. M. Norsa – G. Vitelli, *BSAA* 28 (1933), 1, p. 3 Pf.

παρα]τ̣ίθετα̣ί τε ἐν σ(υγ)κρίσει τὰ ὀλίγων στί-
χ(ων) ὄν]τ̣(α) ποιήματα Μιμνέρμου τοῦ Κο-
λοφω]νίου καὶ Φιλ{ε}ῖτα τοῦ Κῴου βελτ{ε}ίονα
τ(ῶν) πολ]υστίχων αὐτ(ῶν) φάσκων εἶναι[. . . .]

3 Φιλειτατ᾽ου Pap. **4** αυτ′ Pap.: αὐτ(ῶν) edd.: αὐτὰ Pohlenz, sed v. Ll-J – Parsons ad *SH* 675, McNamee 83–6

Cf. Σ Londinensia ad vv. 9–12 ap. PLitLond. 181.ii.9–13, pap. saec. p.C. I, ed. H. J. M. Milne, *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*, London 1927, 148, p. 3 Pf., cf. G. Massimilla, *SIFC* 84 (1991), 71, W. Luppe, *ZPE* 115 (1997), 50

ἤτοι πολὺ καθέλ|κει ἢ τ(ὴν) πολὺ μακ̣(ρὴν) |
ἐδίδαξαν αἱ ἁ[π]α̣λ̣(αὶ) | οὐκ ἐδίδ(αξεν) ἡ
μεγάλ(η) | λέγει ὅτι γλυκ(ὺς) ὁ Μίμ(νερμος) |

2 αἱ κατὰ λεπτ(όν) Rostagni, sed λεπτ᾽ quod supra α̣.τ̣α̣ (i.e. κατα) legere sibi visi sunt ipse et Milne, revera legi non potest, v. Luppe *l.l.*, qui legit αι α.α̣λ̣, i.e. αἱ ἁ[π]α̣λ̣(αὶ)

8. Crates *AP* 11.218 = *HE* 1

Χοιρίλος Ἀντιμάχου πολὺ λείπεται, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν
  Χοιρίλον Εὐφορίων εἶχε διὰ στόματος,
καὶ κατάγλωσσ᾽ ἐπόει τὰ ποιήματα, καὶ τὰ Φιλίτα
  ἀτρεκέως ᾔδει· καὶ γὰρ Ὁμηρικὸς ἦν.

Κράτητος (caret Pl.) **3** φίλιτρα P: Φιλητᾶ Dobree (Φιλίτα Nowacki)

9. Antig. Car. *Mir.* 19, *PGR* 42.125 (v. fr. 14)

(bugonia) ᾧ καὶ φαίνεται Φιλίτας προσέχειν, ἱκανῶς ὢν περίεργος.

10. Σ A (Did.) *Il.* 1.524c, I.142 Erbse (v. fr. 54)

Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Φιλητᾶν προφέρεται

Cf. Σ A (Did.) *Il.* 2.111b, I.202 Erbse (v. fr. 55) ἐν γοῦν τῷ Πρὸς Φιλίταν συγγράμματι etc.

1 Φιλιτᾶν A: Φιλίταν olim Erbse, at v. *Schol. Il.* ii, 548 (Addenda et Corrigenda ad *Il.* 2.111b)

11. Strabo 14.2.19, III.917 Meineke + Aly 108.iii.1

(de Cois illustribus narrans) οὗτός τε [sc. Hippocrates] δή ἐστι τῶν ἐνδόξων Κῷος ἀνὴρ καὶ Σίμος ὁ ἰατρός, Φιλίτας τε ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός, καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς Νικίας ὁ καὶ τυραννήσας Κῴων etc.

2 Φιλίτας Π et codd., cf. fr. 17

12a. Σ marg. ad Theoc. 7.40 ap. POxy. 2064, pap. saec. p.C. II, edd. Hunt-Johnson 8.

Φιλητας π]ο̣ιητὴς ε̣γέν[ετο
μητρὸ]ς δ(ὲ) Εὐκ̣τιόνης [
θανο]ῦσαν ἔθαψε̣ν [

omnia suppl. edd. prr. "In the second line πατρος μεν Τηλεφου may well have preceded, if μητρο]ς δ(ε) Ευκτιόνης is rightly restored" idd. Cf. P. J. Parsons ad POxy. 3548 (1983), H. Maehler in Montanari 101–2. Ad 3 v. p. 26.

12b. Σ KU^{m} Theoc. 7.40f, 89.21 Wendel

Φιλητᾶς Κῷος τὸ γένος, ὡς δέ τινες Ῥόδιος, υἱὸς Τηλέφου. ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ποιητής.

Cf. Σ GPT id. 7.40g, 90.1 Wendel ὁ Φιλητᾶς Κῷος ἦν ἢ ὡς ἔνιοι Ῥόδιος ποιητής, υἱὸς Τηλέφου.

1 pro καὶ αὐτὸς π., ποιητὴς ἄριστος U **3** Φιλητὴς codd.

13. Σ KGLEAT Theoc. 7.5–9k, 79.20 Wendel

Βούριναν: κρήνην λέγει τῆς Κῶ. Φιλητᾶς· [fr. 6]. Νικάνωρ δὲ ὁ Κῷος ὑπομνηματίζων φησί· 'Βούρινα πηγὴ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἐστίν, ἧς τὸ πρόσωπον βοὸς ῥινὶ παραπλήσιον'.

Cf. id. PT 7.5–9o, 81.24 Wendel Νικάνωρ δὲ ὁ Κῷος ὑπομνηματίζων Βούριναν τὴν κρήνην καλεῖ etc.

1 Φιλητᾶς G: Φιλιτᾶς LEAT: Φιλίτας K **2** πηγὴ om. K **3** ἧς — παραπλήσιον KG: ἢ τῷ ἀφ' ὕψους καὶ τῆλε βοὸς ῥινὶ παραπλήσιος LEAT **5** Βούρριν καὶ codd.: Βούρριναν Ahrens

14. Vita Theoc. KE^{b}APT, 1.9 Wendel

ἀκουστὴς δὲ γέγονε [sc. Theocritus] Φιλητᾶ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδου, ὧν μνημονεύει (7.40). ἤκμασε δὲ κατὰ Πτολεμαῖον τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Λάγου.

ita fere Anecd. Estense iii, 9.10 Wendel

3 post ἐπικληθέντα <Φιλάδελφον τὸν Πτολεμαίου τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος> Ahrens, τὸν ἐπικλ. Λάγου deleverit Wil. | Λαγωὸν KE^{b}AT: Λάγων P: corr. Dindorf

15. Suid. ζ 74, II.506.18 Adler (Hesychii Mil. epitomator)

Ζηνόδοτος, Ἐφέσιος, ἐποποιὸς καὶ γραμματικός, μαθητὴς Φιλητᾶ, ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου γεγονὼς τοῦ πρώτου, ὃς καὶ πρῶτος τῶν Ὁμήρου διορθωτὴς ἐγένετο καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βιβλιοθηκῶν προὔστη καὶ τοὺς παῖδας Πτολεμαίου ἐπαίδευσεν.

inde 'Zonaras' *Lex.* col. 956 Tittm. Ζηνόδοτος, ubi Φιλητοῦ codd.

16. Σ Nic. *Ther.* 3, 35.13 Crugnola

ὁ Ἑρμησιάναξ οὗτος φίλος τῷ Φιλητᾷ καὶ γνώριμος ἦν. τούτῳ τὰ Περσικὰ γέγραπται (*CA* 12), καὶ τὰ εἰς Λεόντιον τὴν ἐρωμένην. οὐ δύναται δὲ Νίκανδρος μνημονεύειν τούτου διὰ τῆς προσφωνήσεως, διὰ τὸ τὸν Φιλητᾶν πρεσβύτερον εἶναι Νικάνδρου, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Νίκανδρος μέμνηται τοῦ Ἑρμησιάνακτος ὡς πρεσβυτέρου ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφῶνος ποιητῶν (*FGrH* 271–2 F 10).

Σ deest ap. V **1** ὁ Ἑρμησιάναξ et φίλος om. G | Φιλητᾷ Lp: Φιλιτᾷ G: Φιλητῇ β **4** Φιλητὴν β **4–6** καὶ αὐτὸς — ποιητῶν om. dG (add. G^{1})

17. Vita Arati ii, 11.5 Martin

{ἐν} τοῖς χρόνοις δὲ ἐγένετο [sc. Arat.] κατὰ Φιλάδελφον τὸν βασιλέα, συνήκμαζε δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Αἰτωλῷ (T. 4 Magnelli) καὶ Φιλητᾷ καὶ Διονυσίῳ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ . . ., οὗ καθηγήσατο τὰ μαθηματικὰ ὁ Ἄρατος.

Cf. Vita Arati iv, 19.4 Martin ἦν δὲ [sc. Arat.] ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου . . . συνήκμασε δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Αἰτωλῷ (T. 6 Magnelli) καὶ Καλλιμάχῳ καὶ †Μελανδρίω καὶ Φιλητᾷ.

1 secl. Westermann **7** μελανδρίω A: μελανχρίω Ma, Ma^{2}: Μενάνδρω P, Est.: om. S: Νικάνδρῳ Ritschl, fort. recte, v. Cameron 1995, 195: Λεανδρίῳ Wendel, v. Call. T. 10a Pf. | Φιλητᾶ plurr.: Φιλιτᾶ S

18a. Proclus *Chrest.* 27, I.2.38 Severyns, ap. Phot. *Bibl.* 319b11, V.158 Henry

λέγει δὲ [sc. Proclus de elegia] καὶ ἀριστεῦσαι τῷ μέτρῳ Καλλῖνόν τε τὸν Ἐφέσιον καὶ Μίμνερμον τὸν Κολοφώνιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν τοῦ Τηλέφου Φιλήταν τὸν Κῷον καὶ Καλλίμαχον τὸν Βάττου· Κυρηναῖος οὗτος δ' ἦν.

Cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 114b20, II.157 Henry (inter poetas a Stobaeo libro iv florilectos) Ὑψαῖος, Φιλήτας, Φιλόξενος, Φιλιππίδης.

3 τοῦ A: om. M | Φιλῆταν A: Φιλήταν B: Φιλῆτα M, at A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus* i, Liége 1938, 118 formas codd. corruptelas orthographicas pro Φιλίταν habet | κῶον A: κῶ M

18b. Canones Byzantini, tab. M v, Poetae elegiaci, ap. O. Kroehnert, *Canonesne poetarum scriptorum artificum per antiquitatem fuerunt?*, Königsberg 1897, 6

ἐλεγειοποιηταὶ δʹ. Καλλῖνος, Μίμνερμος, Φιλήτας, Καλλίμαχος.

Cf. Tab. C xii ap. Kroehnert, op.c., 13, et cod. N ap. H. Rabe, *RhM* n.s. 65 (1910), 342 ἐλεγείων ποιηταί· Καλλῖνος, Μίμνερμος, Φιλίτας, Καλλίμαχος.

18c. Tzetzes, *Praef. Schol. Lyc. Alex.*, 3.15 Scheer

ἐλεγείων δὲ ποιηταὶ Καλλίμαχος, Μίμνερμος, Φιλητᾶς.

19. Quint. 10.1.58, 579.11 Winterbottom

tunc et elegiam vacabit in manus sumere, cuius princeps habetur Callimachus, secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupavit.

2 Philetas *1418 (cod. rec.)*: Philatas *γ*: Phileta *G*

20. Plut. *An seni sit gerenda res publica* 791e, V.1.42 Humbert

ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Πρόδικον τὸν σοφιστὴν ἢ Φιλήταν τὸν ποιητὴν ἀξιῶν πολιτεύεσθαι, νέους μὲν ἰσχνοὺς δὲ καὶ νοσώδεις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ κλινοπετεῖς δι' ἀρρωστίαν ὄντας, ἀβέλτερός ἐστιν, οὕτως ὁ κωλύων ἄρχειν καὶ στρατηγεῖν τοιούτους γέροντας οἷος etc.

21. Athen. 9.401d–e, II.375 Kaibel

καὶ ὁ Δημόκριτος ἔφη· ἀεί ποτε σύ, ὦ Οὐλπιανέ, οὐδενὸς μεταλαμβάνειν εἴωθας τῶν παρασκευαζομένων πρὶν μαθεῖν εἰ ἡ χρῆσις μὴ εἴη τῶν ὀνομάτων παλαιά. κινδυνεύεις οὖν ποτε διὰ ταύτας τὰς φροντίδας ὥσπερ ὁ Κῷος Φιλίτας ζητῶν τὸν καλούμενον ψευδολόγον τῶν λόγων ὁμοίως ἐκείνῳ διαλυθῆναι. ἰσχνὸς γὰρ πάνυ τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὰς ζητήσεις γενόμενος ἀπέθανεν, ὡς τὸ πρὸ τοῦ μνημείου αὐτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα δηλοῖ (Anon. *FGE* 134, cf. *All. Poet. Ascr.* 5)·

ξεῖνε, Φιλίτας εἰμί. λόγων ὁ ψευδόμενός με
ὤλεσε καὶ νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἑσπέριοι.

4 φιλιτᾶς A: φιλητᾶς CE **4–5** ψευδολόγον ACE: ψευδόμενον Herwerden **9** φιλιτας A

22a. Athen. 12.552b, III.218 Kaibel = Adesp. *PCG* *122

λεπτότερος δ' ἦν καὶ Φιλίτας ὁ Κῷος ποιητής, ὃς καὶ διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἰσχνότητα σφαίρας ἐκ μολύβου πεποιημένας εἶχε περὶ τὼ πόδε, ὡς μὴ ὑπὸ ἀνέμου ἀνατραπείη.

1 Φιλίτας A: Φιλήτας CE **2** εἶχε CE: ἔχει A

22b. Ael. *VH* 10.6, 115.7 Dilts

ἐκωμῳδοῦντο εἰς λεπτότητα Σαννυρίων ὁ κωμῳδίας ποιητὴς καὶ Μέλητος ὁ τραγῳδίας ποιητὴς καὶ Κινησίας κυκλίων χορῶν καὶ Φιλητᾶς ποιητὴς ἑξαμέτρων.

3 ποιητὴς del. Hercher | ἑξαμέτρων Vx: πενταμέτρων Ruhnken, probante Meineke 351

22c. Ael. *VH* 9.14, 106.1 Dilts

Φιλητᾶν λέγουσι τὸν Κῷον λεπτότατον γενέσθαι τὸ σῶμα. ἐπεὶ τοίνυν ἀνατραπῆναι ῥᾴδιος ἦν ἐκ πάσης προφάσεως, μολίβου, φασί, πεποιημένα εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς ὑποδήμασι πέλματα, ἵνα μὴ ἀνατρέπηται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνέμων, εἴ ποτε σκληροὶ κατέπνεον.

23a. Prop. 2.1.4–6

ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit.
sive illam Cois fulgentem incedere vidi,
totum de Coa veste volumen erit.

Cf. id. 4.5.57–8

qui versus Coae dederit, nec munera vestis,
istius tibi sit surda sine aere lyra.

Cf. Call. T. 6, v. Heyworth 209 **5** vidi *dett.*: cogis *codd.* **6** hac totum e *codd.*: totum de *dett.* **58** aere *NA*: arte *cett.*

23b. Prop. 2.34.29–32

aut quid †erechti tibi prosunt carmina lecta?
nil iuvat in magno vester amore senex.
tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan
et non inflati somnia Callimachi.

29 erechti *N*: crethei *plurr.*: erec(h)th(a)ei (= Aeschyli) *V corr. in marg., Volscus*: Cretaei (= Epimenidis) *edd. vett., alii alia* | lecta *codd.*: plectri *Palmer* **31** satius *codd.*: potius *Schrader* | memorem musis *N, P corr.*: musis memorem *cett.*: Musis leviorem *Santem*: Meropem Musis *Jacob*: Cererem Musis *Stroh*: *"locus vexatissimus, mea sententia prorsus deperditus" Fideli* | Philitan *plurr.*: Philita *NL*: Filita *F*: Philitae *Santem*

23c. Prop. 3.1.1–12

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros.
dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro?
quove pede ingressi? quamque bibistis aquam?
a valeat, Phoebum quicumque moratur in armis!
exactus tenui pumice versus eat,
quo me Fama levat terra sublimis, et a me
nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis,
et mecum in curru parvi vectantur Amores,
scriptorumque meas turba secutas rotas.

1 Philitae *codd.*: Philetae *N*

23d. Prop. 3.3

1 Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra
Bellerophontei qua fluit umor equi
. . . .
13 cum me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus
sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra:
'quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine? quis te
carminis heroi tangere iussit opus?
17 non hinc ulla tibi speranda est fama, Properti:
mollia sunt parvis prata terenda rotis.
. . . .'
25 dixerat, et plectro sedem mihi monstrat eburno,
quo nova muscoso semita facta solo est.
hic erat affixis viridis spelunca lapillis,
pendebantque cavis tympana pumicibus,
29 orgia Musarum et Sileni patris imago
fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeaee, tui.
. . . .
33 diversaeque novem sortitae iura Puellae
exercent teneras in sua dona manus:
haec hederas legit in thyrsos, haec carmina nervis
aptat, at illa manu texit utraque rosam.
37 e quarum numero me contigit una dearum
(ut reor a facie, Calliopea fuit):
'contentus niveis semper vectabere cycnis,
nec te fortis equi ducet ad arma sonus.
. . . .'
51 talia Calliope, lymphisque a fonte petitis
ora Philitea nostra rigavit aqua.

17 hic *codd.*: hinc *dett., Volscus* **29** Ergo *codd.*: corr. Heinse **52** Philitea *codd.*: Philetea *L, dett.*

23e. Prop. 3.9.43–6

inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos
et cecinisse modis, Coe poeta, tuis.
haec urant pueros, haec urant scripta puellas,
meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant!

44 dure *codd.*: Coe *Beroaldus*: Dore *Scriverius*: pure *Scaliger*: care *A. Allen,* Hermes *123 (1995), 377*: docte *Foster* **45** curant *bis codd.*: *corr. dett.*

23f. Prop. 4.6.1–4

Sacra facit vates: sint ora faventia sacris,
  et cadat ante meos icta iuvenca focos.
serta Philiteis certet Romana corymbis
  et Cyrenaeas urna ministret aquas.

3 cera *codd.* (*fort. corrupt. ex* certet): *corr. Scaliger* | philippeis *codd.*: Philetaeis *dett.*

24a. Ov. *Ars am.* 3.329–30

sit tibi Callimachi, sit Coi nota poetae,
  sit quoque vinosi Teia Musa senis.

24b. Ov. *Rem. am.* 759–60

Callimachum fugito, non est inimicus amori;
  et cum Callimacho tu quoque, Coe, noces.

24c. Ov. *Tristia* 1.6.1–2

Nec tantum Clario Lyde dilecta poetae
  nec tantum Coo Battis amata suo est,
pectoribus quantum tu nostris, uxor, inhaeres,
  digna minus misero, non meliore viro.

1 lyde *F*: lide *GDT*: idem *M* **2** battis *F*: batis *L*: bactis *D*: baccis *GT*: Bittis *Merkel*

24d. Ov. *Ex Ponto* 3.1.57–8

nec te nesciri patitur mea pagina, qua non
  inferius Coa Battide nomen habes.

58 coa battide *s*: coabit tibi de *A*: c^{h}oab* tibi de *B*: coa pithyde *C*: coa batide *le*: choa bachide *ebl*: Coa Bittide *Merkel*

25. Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.252–5

hunc ipse Coo plaudente Philitas
Callimachusque senex Umbroque Propertius antro
ambissent laudare diem, nec tristis in ipsis
Naso Tomis divesque foco lucente Tibullus.

252 choo . . philytes *M*: coo . . philetes *dett.*: Philitas *Klotz*, *cf. Prop. Tt. 23b sq.*

26. Choerob. ad Theod. Alex. 360.16, I.338.10 Hilgard (cf. fr. 5)

Φιλίτας ὁ διδάσκαλος Θεοκρίτου

Φιλίππας NC: Φιλητὸς V: Φιλητᾶς Bernhardy, *Gr. Lit.* ii.2 1845, 568, M. Haupt, *Hermes* 6 (1871), 185

27. Tzetzes *Exeg. Il.*, 126.9 Hermann

πολλοὶ τῆς Ὁμηρικῆς ἐτυμολογίας ἐπεμελήθησαν . . . Ἀρίσταρχος, Ζηνόδοτος, Φιλητᾶς, Σαπφὼ καὶ ἕτεροι.

ALLEGED TESTIMONIA

I. *Dubia*

1. Call. *HyAp.* 110–2

> Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
> ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
> πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.

These verses may constitute an overt reference to *Demeter* and the fact that no ancient authority confirms this may only be due to lack of scholiastic information. Müller 1987, 40–1 (cf. *id.* 1990, 28) suggested that the Callimachean lines "scheinen geradezu ein Philitas-Zitat zu sein". A three-verse direct loan would be unparalleled in Call. As elsewhere, the Cyrenean has subtler ways of incorporating Philitan material than direct quotation. For the contrast between a big river (the muddy Assyrian river in Call.) and a small spring cf. Prop. T. 23d.15–6, 51–2.

2. Antip. Thess. *AP* 11.20.2–4 = *GPh* 20.2–4

> (φεύγετε . . .) ποιητῶν φῦλον ἀκανθολόγων
> οἵ τ' ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες
> κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λιτὸν ὕδωρ.

After *GPh* ii, 38 ("since Philetas may be called the head of the school which A[ntip]. is decrying A[ntip]. perhaps remembers his description of the poet" [fr. 25.3–4]), Hollis 1996, 61 n. 33 held that Antip., active in Rome at the end of the 1st cent. BC, in this epigram evoking Archilochus against the Callimachean school of poetry, "specifically attacks Philetas". An allusion to P. would seem very possible here. κρήνης ἐξ ἱερῆς and λιτὸν ὕδωρ may evoke Philitan images too.

3. The possibility that old Φιλητᾶς as *praeceptor amoris* in Long. 2.3–7 harbours features of the Coan's poetry, seems to be partly confirmed by the influence of *Demeter*. Philitan reception in Longus takes place through Theoc. Cf. here *Perp. Propos.* 5, 6 and see p. 64f.

II. *Perperam Proposita*

1. Hollis 1978, 403 supplemented the lacuna in Call. *Aet.* T. 7a.10 with θ ε ῦ ν] and made "the relatively less demanding assumption that Philetas (or conceivably another poet) wrote a long work bearing, like the *Demeter*, the name of a goddess for its title". This Callimachean verse appears to contain a reference to a poem contrasted to *Demeter*, but it is far from certain that this was by P.

The lacuna in Call. T. 7a.10 has given rise to further speculation. The supplement γ ρ α ῦ ν] would allude to *Bittis*: "waiving any doubts over the space in the papyrus (will it take five letters?) . . . a description of Bittis as 'the old woman' would surely be grotesque", Hollis 1978, 403. Knox 67–8 found this supplement "a bit inappropriate", but still regarded *Bittis* as "the best canditate". G. Vitteli, PSI XI (1935), 141 n. 2 supplemented K ῶ ν] postulating a *ktisis*-poem by P. This found sympathy with R. Pretagostini, *Ricerche sulla poesia alessandrina*, Rome 1984, 128–9 and Sbardella 93f. The latter adduced Call. Tt. 6, 7a, b, Theoc. 7.1–11, Herodas 2.95–8 and Hermesian. T. 2 as references to a poem Κῶς by P. in the line of the anonymous *Meropis* (*SH* 903A). Phylarchus *All. Poet. Ascr.* 3 would be lines from that poem. He also saw room for a shorter poem *Demeter* restrictively dealing with the institution of the goddess' cult on Cos (cf. *id.*, *DNP* IX.820). Puelma 1957, 95 n. 2 conjectured]αὶ κατὰ λεπτόν/Κ ῳ̣ α ι] ascribing to P. "eine Reihe von mittelgroßer elegischer Einzelgedichte in einer Buchsammlung vereinigt", cf. *id.*, *MH* 39 (1982), 226 n. 18. Wimmel 1958, 346–53 favoured δ ρ ῦ ν] referring to an unknown work of the Coan. McKay 1978 accepted this supplement and postulated a poem Κλήθρη on the grounds of fr. 25.2.

C. Gallavotti, *Aegyptus* 22 (1942), 115f. thought that Call. fr. 1.13–6 allude to P.'s longer and shorter poems and by supplementing α [ἱ Κ ῳ̣ α ι in 16 postulated a lost Philitan *Catalogue of Women*. Alfonsi 1943, 161 suggested that P. might have treated, in *Demeter* or "a similar work", the myth of Massagetai against a μακρὸν ἄνδρα.

2. Cat. 95.9–10

Parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta <sodalis>
at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho.

9 <sodalis> *om. codd., add. Aldina*: Philetae *Bergk*: Phanoclis *Rossbach*: Phalaeci *Munro*: Catonis *Leo*

<*sodalis*> in 9 was printed by Avantius in the editio princeps, the so-called Aldina (Venice 1502). Bergk's unfortunate conjecture (*mei*... *Philetae* would sound awkward, see J. B. Solodow, *CPh* 82 (1987), 145, G. Lieberg, *Prometheus* 26 (2000), 137 n. 3) won approval from Rostagni and Puelma 1954, 114, cf. *id.* 1957, 99, *MH* 39 (1982), 224 n. 14. On the poem see W. Clausen, *GRBS* 5 (1964), 188–191, Hutchinson 296–7, Lightfoot 65–6.

3. [Philteas *Naxiaca FGrH* 498]

EtM 795.12 Gaisf. Φιλτέας· παρὰ τὸ φιλῶ φιλτὸς ῥηματικὸν ὄνομα, οὗ παρώνυμον Φιλτέας, ὡς πρῶτος Πρωτέας, ἄριστος Ἀριστέας. Φιλτέας δέ ἐστιν †οκαικαλλαβαιος ἱστόρηκεν, ὁ τὰ Νάξια συνθείς.

Kayser 30–2, 51–2 attributed at least three books of Ναξιακά to P. and *suo arbitrio* declared them to be composed in verse. Bach 82 rejected the speculation on the form, but discussed *Naxiaca* as a genuine work of the Coan. Two pieces of information have survived from this work, Σ Lyc. 633 (211.16 Scheer) ἀμφικλήστους χοιράδας Γυμνησίας] ... Φιλτέας δὲ ἐν τρίτῃ Ναξιακῶν Βαλιαρίδας φησὶν αὐτὰς ὕστερον ὀνομασθῆναι and Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1885.50 καὶ ὁ τὰ Ναξιακὰ γράψας †Φιλήτας εἴτε Καλλῖνος, whence Eudocia added among P.'s works καὶ τὰ καλούμενα Ναξιακά in Suid. T. 1. R. Stiehle, *Philologus* 9 (1854), 505 wanted to establish the Coan's name in the first passage as P. allegedly spoke of the Balearid islands in *All. Poet. Ascr.* 2, overlooking the fact that that lexicographic interpolation does not relate to Strabo's subject matter, see Meineke 351–3, *CA*, 96.

4. Plut. *Per.* 2.1, I.2.2 Ziegler = Philemon *PCG* T. 35

οὐδεὶς εὐφυὴς νέος ἢ τὸν ἐν Πίσῃ θεασάμενος Δία γενέσθαι Φειδίας ἐπεθύμησεν, ἢ τὴν Ἥραν τὴν ἐν Ἄργει Πολύκλειτος, οὐδ' Ἀνακρέων ἢ Φιλήμων ἢ Ἀρχίλοχος ἡσθεὶς αὐτῶν τοῖς ποιήμασιν. οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον, εἰ τέρπει τὸ ἔργον ὡς χαρίεν, ἄξιον σπουδῆς εἶναι τὸν εἰργασμένον.

3 Φιλήμων codd.: Φιλητᾶς Bryan (acceperat Bernardakis): Ἱππῶναξ Cobet

5. From Theoc. 11.1–3 οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,/ Νικία, οὔτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, οὔτ' ἐπίπαστον,/ἢ ταὶ Πιερίδες and

Long. 2.7.7 Ἔρωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον, οὐ πινόμενον, οὐκ ἐσθιόμενον, οὐκ ἐν ᾠδαῖς λεγόμενον, ὅτι μὴ φίλημα καὶ περιβολὴ καὶ συγκατακλιθῆναι γυμνοῖς σώμασι Cairns 1979, 26–7 inferred that "Theocritus' line may . . . be an echo of Philetas". He also traced the pan-pipes in Long. 2.34 back to P. (cf. *id.*, *WS* 97 (1984), 107) and from Long. 2.35 and Call. fr. 1.37 he postulated a poetic encounter of Eros and P. in "Philetan bucolic poetry of erotodidactic character", cf. also Bowie 78. Hunter 1983, 78 expressed reservations about this reasoning. He drew a line linking Longus with Theoc. and, through the latter, with P. (which is, I think, the correct method), to whom he tentatively ascribed numerous expressions or motifs, pp. 79f. Long. 2.37 expressly echoes Theoc., see C. M. Mittelstadt, *RhM* n.s. 113 (1970), 217.

P-H 357 n. 1 credited the Coan with a broader impact on Theoc. 1, where the death of Thyrsis allegedly alludes to P.'s death on the slender grounds that Theoc. was a 'pupil' of P. and Hermes appears in 77 to console Daphnis. F. Cairns, *WSt* 97 (1984), 105–6 also maintained that the poetic symbolisms in Theoc. 1 go back to P., who may have treated a bucolic character Daphnis in his poems. These "would have made Theocritus' readers see Idyll I as extending and supporting the literary manifesto of Philetas". In *ibid.* 97–8 from Prop. T. 23f Cairns inferred that "wax and *corymbi* . . . were a Philetan symbolic complex" so that Theoc. 1.27–31 "may derive from Philetas".

6. *Res Romanae.* The material concerning the alleged influence of P. on the Romans is accumulating and has the potential to grow even more, although it is obstructed by the question of survival. Maass 1895b, 280f. conjectured that Virgil's whole treatment of bugony in *G.* 4.315f. is "a faithful summary" of P. He found support with Cessi 1908, 135–6, L. Malten, *Kyrene*, Berlin 1911, 29f. and Christ-Schmid-Stählin 122, but see fr. 14. Maass 1895a, xi–xiv also thought that from Prop. 3.34.35–6 he could deduce the content of a Philitan poem dealing with the myth of Heracles and Omphale; *contra*: R. Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 31 (1896), 198f. L. Richmond in his Cambridge 1928 ed. p. 221 opined that Prop. 2.12 is a literary translation ("Philetam expressit"!) of a Philitan poem, cf. Wimmel 1960, 193f.; *contra*: Boucher 223 n. 2. W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1924, 29 deduced from Prop. T. 23d that P. in his poems referred to Hippocrene and Aganippe,

but we now know that these come from Call. fr. 2a.16f.

Hubaux 263 from Long. 3.5.4 and Prop. 3.16.13–4 attributed the motif of the lover's immunity to P.; *contra*: Hunter 1983, 82–3. G. Luck, *MH* 105 (1962), 347 read Prop. T. 23b.31 as *tu satius Meropen Musis imitere Philitae* postulating a *Meropis* by P., see p. 238. I. M. LeM. DuQuesnay, *PLLS* 3 (1981), 38–51, esp. 39–40 from the correspondences in Virg. *E.* 2.28–39 and Long. 2.32.7 postulated P. as their common model, cf. also Hunter 1983, 81–2, Bowie 81–3, Thomas 40. From Virg. *E.* 7.4 *ambo florentes aetatibus, Arcades ambo* and its apparent imitation by the roughly contemporary Eryc. *GPh* 1.1–2 Γλαύκων καὶ Κορύδων οἱ ἐν οὔρεσι βουκολέοντες/'Αρκάδες ἀμφότεροι Bowie 82–3 identified the common source that Reitzenstein 1893, 131 n. 2 had postulated, with a bucolic poem by P. supplying "the name Corydon and perhaps even the Arcadian setting". Thomas 58–9 tried to refute the objections meanwhile raised on that point by R. Jenkyns, *JRS* 79 (1989), 34 n. 33. Bowie 81 deduced another Philitan motif from Virg. *E.* 1.5 *formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas* and Long. 2.7.6 ἐπῄνουν τὴν 'Ηχὼ τὸ 'Αμαρυλλίδος ὄνομα μετ' ἐμὲ καλοῦσαν. Thomas 35f. suggested that if Philetas in Long. 2.3 reflects a character in a pastoral poem of P. and since he bears "an uncanny resemblance" to the Corycian old-man in Virg. *G.* 4.116–48, the latter too should hark back to him. So he proposed in p. 54 a *stemma senum* starting from P. and spreading to Theoc. 7, Virg. *E.* 1, *G.* 4 and Longus.

7. Theoc. 24.105–6

> γράμματα μὲν τὸν παῖδα γέρων Λίνος ἐξεδίδαξεν,
> υἱὸς 'Απόλλωνος μελεδωνεὺς ἄγρυπνος ἥρως.

Hunter 1996, 17 n. 67 felt that there is "a fair chance" that the description of Linus as tutor of Heracles here alludes to P.'s education of the young Ptolemy. In p. 27 he argues that in Theoc. 24 the young Heracles may represent, in some respects, the young Ptolemy Philadelphus and it has been suggested that the list of his tutors represents real courtiers such as Theoc. (cf. R. F. Thomas in Harder 1996, 231). Theoc. here may have in mind a teacher's toils, but the tendency to identify descriptions of mythological figures with persons of the poet's ambience may be out of the spirit of the poems.—In another Theocritean passage J. B. Macqueen, *LCM* 8 (1983), 128

lifted P. too high, proposing Κῷον ἀοιδόν in 7.47–8 Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ *Χῖον ἀοιδόν*/ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.

8. R. Herzog, *Philologus* 79 (1924), 426f. held that the antagonistic poet of Herodas in *Mim.* 8 is P. (already O. Crusius, *RE* V.2.2281, "bedenkenswert" for Pöhlmann 258), but J. Sitzler, *PhW* 47 (1927), 40 was sceptical, and Kuchenmüller 24–5 and Pfeiffer 1968, 90 n. 5 ("the incredible fancies of R. Herzog") were categorically against it. A. Rist, *Phoenix* 51 (1997), 354–63 proposed identifying the competing poet with Theocr. — Next to this, M. Musurus supplemented the lacuna after [Mosch.] *EB* 92, in which different cities are said to deplore the loss of Bion more than that of their native poets, with six hexameters of his own including . . . ἔν τε πολίταις/Τριοπίδαις ποταμῷ θρηνεῖ παρ' Ἀλέντι Φιλητᾶς. These used to be considered (e.g. by Bach 17–8) as genuine verses originating "ex codice antiquissimo", see W. Bühler, *Die Europa des Moschos*, Wiesbaden 1960, 14, L. D. Reynolds – N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford [3]1991, 158.

9. [> Hippocr. *Aph.* 1.3]

> Nicetas Choniates *Historia*, 491.3 van Dieten ὅθεν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῶν σωματικῶν ἕξεων ὁ Κῷός φησι ποιητής, ὡς εἰς τὸ ἄκρον προελθοῦσαι φιλοῦσι πρὸς τὸ κάταντες ὡς φιλυπόστροφοι μεταφέρεσθαι, μὴ ἀτρίμας ἔχουσαι μένειν τῷ συνεχεῖ ἀεὶ τῆς κινήσεως, τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Μεσοποταμίτῃ συμπέπτωκεν ἄντικρυς.

E. Livrea, *ZPE* 125 (1999), 67–8 discerned a clausular dactylic formation πρὸς τὸ κάταντες and two dactylic ones, ὡς φιλυπόστροφοι and possibly συνεχὲς ἀεί which he attributed to a Philitan fragment, which Nicetas might have read in an anthology. It was first D. A. Christidis, "Ὁ 'Κῷος ποιητής' τοῦ Νικήτα Χωνιάτη", *Hellenica* 35 (1984), 70–3 who drew attention to this passage. He initially identified its source as Philon fr. 458 (II.149 von Arnim) and suggested that Φίλων was corrupted into Φιλητᾶς whence the appearance of the Κῷος . . . ποιητής in Nicetas. If this assumption was correct, the mistake would show that the literary circles in Constantinople identified P. with the name which Call. used to apply to him, but it is not so. As it has always been thought, the Κῷος ποιητής on whom Nicetas draws, is Hippocrates (cf. *Historia*, 580.89 van Dieten ὁ Κῷος Ἱπποκράτης;

"assolutamente impossibile" for Livrea) and D. A. Christidis, *Hellenica* 46 (1996), 307–16 in a palinode acknowledged the passage of Nicetas as another echo among the many of the Hippocratic topos αἱ ἐπ' ἄκρον εὐεξίαι σφαλεραί, *Aph.* 1.3 (IV.485.11 Littré).

INTRODUCTION

I. *Name*

Philitas *multi nominis* bears a name of uncertain spelling.[1] Up until the beginning of this century the question was whether Φιλητας is oxytone or paroxytone, when Crönert 212f. drew attention to a Coan inscription, 10b.54 P-H = *IdC* ED 178.4 (3rd cent. BC *ex.*), spelling the name as ΦΙΛΙΤΑΣ and concluded that this should be the genuine form of the poet's name as well. Crönert made clear that the accentuation Φιλητᾶς did not exist earlier than Imperial times. Φιλήτας would be derived from φιλεῖν + suffix -τας and Φιλίτας from φίλος + suffix -ίτας. The Doric colour of Φιλήτας and its original accentuation are secured by Suid. ν 336 (Etym.) Νικήτας· ὄνομα κύριον. Δωρικόν. οὕτω καὶ Φιλήτας καὶ φιλήτης κατὰ Δωριεῖς. βαρύνεται δὲ ἄμφω τὰ κοινὰ πρὸς διαστολὴν ἐπιθέτων τοῦ, ὁ νικητὴς καὶ ὁ φιλητής. With regard to the form, a Φιλήτης appears in an Athenian inscription of the m. 4th cent. BC and a genitive Φιλήτεω in 5th cent. BC Chios. Φιλε̄<τ>ας (rather than Φιλε<ί>ας) appears in a *c.* 500 BC inscription from Selinous in Sicily (*SEG* 43.631), Φίλητος in a 3rd cent. BC testimony from Ceos. Φίλητος appears in an Imperial inscription from Cos, 310.1 P-H (Φιλήτου) and as early as 300–290 BC in Rhodes and in numerous later inscriptions from the Aegean islands. Nicaen. of Samos *HE* 1.3 evidences a form Φιλήτιδος, and a patronymic Φιλητάδας appears in two 3rd cent. BC inscriptions from Crete and Argos (> Doric Φιλήτας) and in Call. fr. 199. A feminine Φιλήτα appears in 1st cent. BC Euboia (and later in Crete), Φιλήτη in Naxos and Φιλάτα in Ephesus, both undated, see Masson ii, 506.

Φιλίτας is just as ancient and common. The form is already Mycenean, see Masson i, 131–2, *id.*, *ZPE* 91 (1992), 118–20. It seems to

---

[1] I write P(hilitas) but print either form according to the *fides* of the MS(S) in each particular passage. Where the name of the Coan is disfigured (Φιλίας, Φιλίππας, Φίλτα, *Philippeis, Philytes*) I print Φιλίτας/*Philitas*, which seems the closer form, but Φιλήτα for Φιλέα in fr. 23b from Stobaeus. No other accentuation than the paroxytone is admitted in sources earlier than Imperial times. In Athenaeus I follow cod. A and print Φιλίτας throughout.

have been very common in Cos and in the neighbouring islands. Since Crönert's study, Φιλίτας is also evidenced as the name of a Coan magistrate on a 3rd cent. BC hemidrachm coin, part of a treasure found in Pyle, see *BCH* 78 (1954), 98–9. A poet Φιλίτας slightly younger than P., lived in Samos. In Cos are also attested 10b.37 P-H (3rd cent. BC *ex.*) and *IdC* ED 24.19 (2nd cent. BC) Φιλίτιον, *IdC* ED 14.22 (3rd cent. BC), 178a.B.20 (3rd cent. BC *ex.*), 46.17 (1st cent. BC) Φιλιτίς, known also from 2nd cent. BC Nisyros, Φίλιτος in 1st cent. AD and contemporarily in Calymnos, but Φίλιττος in the latter already in the 3rd cent. BC.[2]

A study of the possible formations is essentially inconclusive. J. Wackernagel in a letter to Kuchenmüller (16 n. 4) asserted that the authentic form of the Coan poet's name can only be determined by the attestations concerning the poet himself.[3] The paradosis, although discrepant, favours the spelling Φιλίτας and the course of corruption, where determinable, seems to be from -ίτας to -ήτας. Codex Marcianus (10th cent.), the main witness of Athenaeus and the principal, if not the only, source of the epitome (Arnott 1996, 37–9) offers Φιλίτας in nineteen quotations including the one of Hermesian. T. 2, whereas the epitome has Φιλητας. The Vatican Strabo-palimpsest of the late 5th cent. (Π in Aly) offers in 8.5.3 Φιλε·ται, i.e. Φιλ{ε}ίται, where all medieval MSS transmit Φιληται. In Σ Theoc. T. 13 the Ambrosian family (K), the best witness of the Theocritean Σ (Wendel 1914, xv), spells the name as Φιλίτας against all other MSS' Φιλητᾶς or -ιτᾶς. The same family offers Φιλήτας in fr. 27, but retains the correct accentuation against all other witnesses' -ητᾶς or -ιτᾶς. Choerob. T. 26 Φιλίππας implies that

[2] Most of the material in readily available in *LGPN*. For Φιλέτας in Athens see A. N. Oikonomides, *Horos* 4 (1986), 43–64, esp. 61–2. On Attic personal names in -ᾱς see Threatte ii, 67f., esp. 75 and in general B-P 12–3. If the name *Pireta*, attested in Pylos, is correctly interpreted, Φιλέτᾱς is already Mycenean, see A. Leukart, *Die frügriechische Nomina auf -tâs und -âs*, Vienna 1994, 262. The -η- form prevailed later, cf. also Roman *Philetus*, fem. *Philete*, see H. Solin, *Die Griechische Personnennamen in Rom* ii, Berlin-N.Y. 1982, 388f.

[3] The main discussion regarding the orthography of P.'s name is Müller 1990. Apart from Crönert, worth consulting are F. Bechtel in *Genethliakon. Festschrift C. Robert*, Berlin 1910, 73, Wil. 1912, 188 n. 3 ("Die Lateinische Überlieferung hat, wie das bei Eigennamen öfter vorkommt, bei Properz das richtige bewahrt"), *CA*, 90, Kuchenmüller 15–7, Gow on Theoc. 7.40, Erbse *Schol. Il.* ii, 548 (Addenda et Corrigenda on Σ *Il.* 2.111b), Masson i, 199 n. 10, *id.*, *ZPE* 91 (1992), 119, Bowie 72 n. 27. All but Bechtel, Kuchenmüller and Erbse (and K. Nickau) go for Φιλίτας. So do Sh-W 541 (in her "Coan Onomasticon") and *LGPN* i, 464.

he was reading in the Theocritean Σ the form Φιλίτας. The same course of corruption is suggested by some *deteriores* of Propertius (cf. esp. T. 23d.52), where the best witnesses offer *Philit-*. The argument that Φιλήτας would be more easily turned into Φιλίτας than vice versa has little value for the Greek sources, since corruption is possible both ways. So φηλήτης repeatedly comes up as a variant of the correct φιλήτης 'thief', see *LSJ* and *Suppl.* s.v. Similarly, in Philicus *SH* 677 Φίλικος is transmitted 3x as Φίληκος in one MS of Hephaestion and in A.R. 4.1487 αὐλίτης is also attested as αὐλήτης or αὐλείτης in some MSS.

The codex Palatinus (P) transmitting Parth. and Antig. Car. offers 3x Φιλίτας. The most ancient testimonies offer Φιλίτας too. Along with the Vatican Strabo-palimpsest (Φιλε·ται = Φιλ{ε}ίται) the same form appears in the Callimachean Σ Florentina T. 7b in a 2nd cent. AD papyrus. POxy. 2258A of the 6th/7th cent. (fr. 16), preserving a Σ which may go back to Theon, has Φιλί[τας. Most importantly, two independent sources dated in the later 3rd cent. BC, PCai. 65445 (Strato T. 4), and in the later 3rd cent. AD, PMil. Vogl. 309 (Posid. T. 3), offer Φιλίτα (in the former case Athen. A had φιλτα). Moreover, Prop. seems to have read in some text of Call. or in an ancient commentary on it the form with an iota. His testimony is important as the name was known in Rome only as *Philetas* and as Prop. remains unaffected by the influence of Greek itacism.

On the other hand, the MSS on Theoc. 7.40,[4] Plut., Quint., Ael., the Σ on Theoc., A.R., and Nic., and almost unanimously all Byzantine sources have Φιλητας, the Byzantines normally stressing -ητᾶς. So do all three MSS of Stobaeus, consistently in eleven quotations (Φιλήτας) including Photius' list of the poets anthologised in Stobaeus' fourth book (T. 18a). However, the spelling of the name in Stobaeus may have been deformed by analogy of Φιλήμων with which it is confused several times (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 6) and Φιλέα in 4.56.11 (fr. 23b), as Müller 1990, 33 suggested, may imply an original Φιλε<ίτ>α. Besides, Plut. and Ael. draw on some passage of Middle comedy ridiculing P. for his slenderness, which perhaps spelt the name with an -ι-, as did Strato T. 4. Two important factors for the possible

[4] Even if the rhyme between Σικελίδαν and Φιλήταν is conscious, it would perhaps bear little significance on the question of spelling as the ἀείδων and ἐρίσδω rhyme in the next verse would suggest.

corruption of Φιλίτας into Φιλήτας are the Imperial times' penchant for Φιλη- names (see Crönert 215, Threatte ii, 71f.) whereas the popularity of Φιλίτας diminishes until it disappears in Byzantine times, and the widespread Imperial spelling of long -ι- with -ει- (Σ Flor. Call. T. 7b, Strabo 8.5.3 (fr. 17) cod. Π), which would easily become an -η- (ΕΙ > Η).

Two considerations have been advanced as arguments for Φιλήτας. First, Longus' 2.3.2, *al.* herdsman Φιλητᾶς, one of the names that Longus apparently borrows from Theoc., has been adduced as a proof that Longus in the 2nd cent. AD was reading Φιλητας in Theoc. 7.40 so that the MSS of Theoc. now preserve the original reading. Both MSS of Longus offer Φιλητᾶς, a form which derives support by a word-play on the name of a *magister amoris* in 2.5.1 ἐμοὶ μέν, ὦ Φιλητᾶ, φιλῆσαί σε πόνος οὐδείς, *al.* This may not be decisive for the name of the poet, as the corruption in Theoc. might go back to Imperial times and Longus may have used the one alternative form which was common at his time and served his purposes better.

Of a similar nature is the second argument relying on an epigram by Crates[5] (T. 8), which is dated in the later 3rd cent. BC. This piece accuses Euph. as a literary *fellator* and plays on the equivocal meanings of poets' names such as Χοιρίλον/εἶχε διὰ στόματος ~ χοῖρος '*pudenda muliebria*' or Ὁμηρικὸς ἦν ~ μηρός 'thigh'. In 3–4 κατάγλωσσ' ἐπόει τὰ ποιήματα καὶ τὰ Φιλίτα/ἀτρεκέως ᾔδει Euph. is said to compose poems 'full of glosses' and P. is mentioned as the author of the celebrated *At. Gl.* An allusion to a second meaning results from φιλητής 'lover, kisser', which would secure the reading Φιλήτας in Crates.[6] In fact it does not. Diosc. *HE* 26.1 needs the second syllable to play on Φιλαινίς/φιλαιδήμων, but Leon. Tar. *HE* 21 and Posid. *HE* 2 play with Φιλαινίς/φιλέω and the root φιλ-

---

[5] The ἐπιγραμμάτων ποιητής mentioned in Diog. Laert. 4.23. See *HE* ii, 222, Pfeiffer 1968, 243.

[6] First Nowacki 17 printed, as everywhere, Φιλίτα and Müller 1990, 36–7 proposed to overcome the difficulty by the identity of the *sound* of Φιλίτας/Φιλήτας in Hellenistic times, but the spelling of the second syllable may anyway be of little importance here. φιλητής 'lover' does not occur until Maced. Cons. *AP* 5.271.3 in the 5th cent. AD, but a connection is clear already in Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 19b τ[ῇ] δὲ γίγνεται Ἑρμ[ῆς] φιλήτης, ὅτι αὐτῇ φιλησίμ[ως] συνεκοιμ[ᾶτο and then in Longus. Call. uses φιλήτωρ (= ἐραστής in the dialect of Crete, Strabo 10.4.22) in frr. 23.4, 229.16. The root φιλ- appears in another libellous epigram on Euph., Theodor. *HE* 14.3–4 ἀλλὰ σὺ τῷ μύστῃ ῥοίην ἢ μῆλον ἄπαρξαι/ἢ μύρτον, καὶ γὰρ ζωὸς ἐὼν ἐφίλει.

alone would appear to suffice, cf. Long. 2.37.3 ὁ Φιλητᾶς θαυμάσας φιλεῖ, Call. *Dieg. Iamb.* 9, fr. 199 (p. 196 Pf.) φιλεῖν τὸν Φιλητάδαν, further Theoc. 10.22 φιλικὸν μέλος 'love-song'. Philod. *GPh* 8.5 στέργοιμι Φιλαίνιον avoids the pun with a synonym. Conversely, Meleag. *HE* 1.24 paraphrased the name of Διοσκορίδης as ὃς Διὸς ἐκ κούρων ἔσχεν ἐπωνυμίην, which suggests the form Διοσκουρίδης, twice transmitted in the Planudean anthology, whereas his name is consistently attested 40x with the correct -o- spelling.

II. *Date*, patria *and* familia

Suidas T. 1 places the acme of P. too early, Φιλητᾶς . . . ὢν ἐπί τε Φιλίππου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου.[7] The expression employed may not refer to the exact date of birth, which would be absurd with two names qualifying it, but may be meant to imply that P.'s life-span goes back as early as the reign of Philip and Alexander (note the chronological order). So in the same lemma there follows ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ διδάσκαλος τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου, which the reductor did not consider as inconsistent with the earlier datum. Alexander succeeded Philip in 336 BC, which would point to a date of birth *c.* 340 BC, so when Ptolemy Soter established his headquarters in Cos in 309/8 BC, P. might have already had a name at Cos. When P. took over the literary education of the future Ptolemy Philadelphus, the young prince may have been in his twelvth year. Therefore the beginning of the Coan's sojourn at Alexandria can be dated at *c.* 297/6 BC.[8] P. was in his heyday then. This seems to be the period in which Strato

[7] On P.'s dates see E. Rohde, "Γέγονε in den Biographica des Suidas" in *Kl. Schr.*, 128. Rohde attributed the misplacement of Zenod. in Suid. T. 15 Ζηνόδοτος . . . μαθητὴς Φιλητᾶ, ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου γεγονὼς *τοῦ πρώτου* to an effort to keep consistent with the entry of P., but see A. Daub, *Studien zu den Biographica des Suidas*, Tübingen 1882, 81. See also Pfeiffer 1968, 107 n. 3, Fraser ii, 464 n. 19 ("ἐπί is probably simply an error for γεγονώς"). On γεγονώς in general see Arnott 1996, 4. For Suid. pointing to P.'s date of birth cf. already F. W. Ritschl, *Opusc. Phil.* i, Leipzig 1866, 66.

[8] P. did not take over from Philadelphus' early childhood, cf. [Plato] *Axioch.* 366d ὁπόταν δὲ εἰς τὴν ἑπταετίαν ἀφίκηται . . . ἐπέστησαν παιδαγωγοὶ καὶ γραμματισταὶ καὶ παιδοτρίβαι . . . αὐξανομένου δὲ κριτικοί, γεωμέτραι etc. Philip of Macedon invited Aristotle as tutor of his son Alexander at 343/2 BC, when the latter was fourteen years old. Aristotle's tutorship did not last for more than three years.

wrote his *Phoinikides* (T. 4, see Nesselrath 62–3). P.'s coeducator, Strato, left Alexandria in 288 BC to take over the direction of Peripatus in Athens, by which time young Ptolemy's education was complete. P. left Alexandria earlier than this date leaving behind his 'pupil' Zenodotus to finish the job. After his departure Zenodotus became the first Royal Librarian in *c.* 284 BC and Philadelphus acceded to power as co-regent with his father in 285 BC and as monarch from 283 BC onwards. P. seems to have returned to Cos in the later 290's and to have died there sometime in the 280's. The decade 280–270 BC appears to be the period when *Leontion* T. 2 was composed (Fraser ii, 883 n. 61, Hardie 36), which seems to refer to P. as being dead. This consorts with the evidence provided by Posid. T. 3, which was written in Alexandria in *c.* 270 BC shortly after Philadelphus' deification, to which it refers in v. 9.[9] P. seems to have been long dead when this epigram was written, as vv. 5–6 τὸν . . ./πρ]έσβυν and 8 ὁ γέρων may imply, cf. Call. fr. 75.76 (Xenomedes) πρέσβυς, Leon. Tar. *HE* 31.1 πρέσβυν Ἀνακρείοντα and 3 ὁ γέρων, *id. HE* 90, Meleag. *HE* 4.1. The synchronisation of P. with Aratus in the latter's *lives* (T. 17) is misleading. P.'s name may have been suggested by some link with Aratus or might be due to the preceding reference to Ptolemy Philadelphus. There follows a reference to Alexander of Aetolia, himself associated with Philadelphus: he and Lycophron ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου προτραπέντες τὰς σκηνικὰς ἐδιόρθωσαν βίβλους according to Tzetzes.

P. is always referred to as a Coan. Strabo T. 11 mentioned him as one of the most famous Coans and he is a Coan in the Σ Flor. on Call. T. 7b and in Posid. T. 3.10. The content of *Demeter* is in accord with this and the ethnic Φιλίτα Σαμίου of the Samian epigrammatist in *AP* (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 4) may have been added by the corrector to distinguish him from his more famous Coan namesake. Only Σ Theoc. 7.40f, g report of τινες (or ἔνιοι) as regarding him as a Rhodian and von Blumenthal 2165 and G-P (*HE* ii, 476) suggested that this may be his place of birth while Cos would be his place of activity. P.'s fame may have generated the claim in some Rhodian quarters that he was their countryman. Such scandalous ap-

[9] Which in its turn agrees with earlier indications that Posidippus was active in Alexandria between *c.* 284–270 BC, see T. B. L. Webster, *WS* 76 (1963), 73, Ll-J ii, 192, Hollis 1996, 59 n. 23 ("Poseidippus was some thirty years younger than Philetas").

propriations were not uncommon.[10] Comedians originating in Rhodes made careers in Athens, e.g. Anaxandrides of Camiros (4th cent. BC). Some maintained that Antiphanes too (4th cent. BC) was a Rhodian (*PCG* T. 1). If it was they who first introduced P. as a curious type of intellectual in Athens, his alleged Rhodian origin would be accounted for.[11] Kuchenmüller 18 n. 1 suggested that the Rhodians might have granted a honorary citizenship to P. This seems possible. A connection with Rhodes would be facilitated, should P. have treated Rhodian subjects in some of his poems. It is less likely that the connection is a confusion with a Rhodian namesake (Nowacki 10).

He must have grown up in an environment friendly to letters. After the bankruptcy of Athens and before Alexandria took over, the SE Aegean became the centre of intellectual and literary activity. Medics, epic poets, dramatists, historians, philosophers, geographers and artists make up a picture of a congenial ambience.[12] The educational upheaval in Cos is satirised by Herodas 3 which features a hopeless pupil as a protagonist. Herodas' references to Nossis, Erinna and Baucis (6.20, 7.56–7) indicate that these figures were familiar to his readership. In the 3rd cent. BC a new theatre was constructed in the town of Cos (*IdC* ED 206a.20 = 10a.25 P-H (3rd cent. BC *ex.*), Antig. Car. *Mir.* 33 = Call. fr. 407.161, see Herzog 156–8, Sh-W 25) — along with a new agora, a new harbour and fortifications around it. Roughly coeval with P. was the local historian Macareus (*FGrH* 456) author of Κῳακά in at least three books; Coan Socrates wrote an Ἐπικλήσεις θεῶν (see fr. 5a.b) and an undated (late Imperial?) historian, Sisyphus (*FGrH* 50), published a version of the Trojan wars. Nicanor (3rd cent. BC *ex.*?) was a philologist who wrote a commentary on P.'s *Demeter*, Phylarchus (*SH* 694A) was apparently a local poet and so may have been the anonymous author of the *Meropis*

---

[10] So e.g. Duris of Samos *FGrH* 76 F 64 claimed Panyassis and Herodotus as Samians, and Antim. fr. 166 and Nic. *FGrH* 271–2 F 36 claimed Homer as a Colophonian.

[11] On comic statements sanctioned as biographical data, see Lefkowitz 105f. So are to explain the allegations that Aristophanes was a Rhodian or a Lindian (Ar. *PCG* Tt. 1.21, 2a.2–4, 11.2–3) or that Sophocles was a Phliasian, see Lefkowitz 112. A fragment of Anaxandrides, *PCG* 20 ὅτε τὰς μορίας ἔτρωγεν ὥσπερ <καὶ> Πλάτων, shows that he was at least aware of intellectual eccentricities.

[12] See Wil. 1924 i, 49–53, Pfeiffer 1968, 93, Schwinge 29, *KWH*, 829. For Cos see Sh-W 13f.; for Rhodes H. von Gaertringen, *RE Suppl.* V.822f., esp. 833–4, L. Rossetti – P. Liviabella Furiani in Cambiano 677f.; for Samos G. Shipley, *A History of Samos 800–188 BC*, Oxford 1987, 224–8.

SH 903A. Xenocritus and Philinus, both 3rd cent. BC, occupied themselves with medical lexicography. Many other Coan literates *minoris momenti* of Imperial times are recorded in Herzog 211 n. 1.

About P.'s family we know little. His father was called Τήλεφος (Σ Theoc. Tt. 12a?, b, Procl. T. 18a — and Σ A.R. fr. 22?) and if T. 12a is correctly supplemented, his mother Εὐκτιόνη. Some have suggested, implausibly, I think, that his poem *Telephus* was dedicated to his father. T. 12a suggests close ties between the poet and his family. *A. S. Hollis raised the possibility that θαν]οῦσαν ἔθαψεν[in that Σ might derive from a reference to his mother's death and burial in one of P.'s own poems. The formula would be appropriate of such an event, cf., in verse, Posid. PMil. Vogl. 309.xiv.25 θανόντα . . . καὶ ἔθαψεν, Hermesian. *CA* 7.43 θανοῦσαν ὑπὸ ξηρὴν θέτο γαῖαν, Theoc. 1.72 ἔκλαυσε θανόντα, and if, as it seems, the reference applies to P.'s mother, it could hark back to a poem of his. P.'s lineage may well be noble, a possibility enhanced from a magistrate Φιλίτας attested on a 3rd cent. BC coin and an ancient doctor of the same name *ap.* Galen Περὶ τροφῶν δυνάμεως 6.473 Kühn (the last noted by Wil. 1924 i, 114–5). The name Τήλεφος is twice evidenced in Cos in contemporary sources and was common in neighbouring islands as well. Εὐκτιόνη is unattested elsewhere in the Aegean and it is a rare name altogether which suggests some elitism.

IIIa. *'Pupils': Ptolemy Philadelphus*

While P. is said to be 'teacher' of many, nothing is known of his own teachers. This is to be expected from a pioneer such as he was. His industry and erudition quickly granted him a good name. Two events seem to have enhanced his fame in a decisive way. Firstly, when he took over the 'Department of Literature' in the 'University of Cos', probably an institution with an established reputation.[13] Secondly, when the first Ptolemy, following an ancient aristocratic tradition, invited P. to Alexandria and assigned him the literary edu-

[13] We are not explicitly told that P. led a school at Cos, but the way to the Ptolemaic Court would have to go through this first. It was correctly felt by Bach 6 and J. Sirinelli, *Les enfants d'Alexandre*, Paris 1993, 146. Hardie 21–3 surmised the existence of a Coan Museum on the prototype of the Alexandrian one, in which P. would play a prominent role.

cation of the future Ptolemy Philadelphus, Suid. T. 1 ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ διδάσκαλος τοῦ δευτέρου Πτολεμαίου.[14] Philadelphus was born on Cos, where "obstetrics was a special study" (Craik 82), during a successful campaign of his father in Caria and Mysia, and never lost his allegiance to it.[15] He and P. may have established a close personal relationship. Philadelphus used to honour his favourites with statues (e.g. his cup-bearer Clino, Athen 10.425e-f) and he assigned the famous sculptor Hecataeus of Lesbos with the making of a statue of P., which was set up in the royal court in Alexandria (Posid. T. 3). The Ptolemies had an interest in literature and science and Philadelphus strongly fostered literary activity in Alexandria.[16] The *life* i of Aratus attributes to Πτολεμαῖος . . ὁ βασιλεύς an epigram (*SH* 712 = *FGE*, 84) praising Aratus as λεπτολόγος. If by Philadelphus, the literary criticism might echo his teacher's precepts.

Ptolemy Euergetes invited to Alexandria, for the same purpose, another scientist of stature, Strato of Lampsacus τῶν ἄλλων Περιπατητικῶν ὁ κορυφαιότατος (fr. 35 = Plut. *Adv. Col.* 1115b), probably, as Wehrli v, 48 suggested, on the recommendation of Demetrius of Phaleron. According to Diog. Laert. 5.58 (T. 1 Wehrli) he was ἀνὴρ ἐλλογιμώτατος, who καθηγήσατο Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου καὶ ἔλαβε, φασί, παρ' αὐτοῦ τάλαντα ὀγδοήκοντα, cf. Suid. σ 1185 (T. 2 Wehrli). On the authority of this testimony one may assume that P. was also the recipient of an equally extraordinary amount of money for his tutorship. The two may have been active at the same time.

---

[14] Nowacki 10 and R. Blum, *Kallimachos, the Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, Wisconsin 1991, 98 are inclined to believe that the young Ptolemy stayed for that purpose at Cos. For Pfeiffer 1968, 92 and Schwinge 29 n. 76 the question can not be answered. However, Alexandria is by far the more likely possibility (Susemihl i, 174 n. 8, Couat 72, Wil. 1924 i, 114, 119, Fraser i, 308, see next n.). We know that Strato had to move there as well. This now seems confirmed by P.'s statue in the Ptolemaic court. His byname Κῷος looks like a designation stemming in the ambience of Alexandria.

[15] See H. Volkmann, *RE* XXIII.1665–66. A later tradition in Cos might have held that Philadelphus was brought up on Cos, cf. Meleag. *HE* 3.3 <ἃ> καὶ Δία θρεψαμένα Κῶς, Σ Ψ Call. *HyDel.* 165 (II.70.96 Pf.) διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖσε ἀνατραφῆναι τὸν Φιλάδελφον Πτολεμαῖον ἐν τῇ Κῷ, but contrast Theoc. 17.59 with Σ ad loc. (321.8 Wendel) ὁ Φιλάδελφος ἐν Κῷ τῇ νήσῳ ἐγεννήθη ὑπὸ Βερενίκης (< Theon fr. *174), Call. *HyDel.* 160f., *Marmor Parium FGrH* 239 B.19. Ptolemy Euergetes stayed at Cos for some months and departed in the spring of 308 BC (Diod. Sic. 20.37.1).

[16] See Fraser i, 311 with nn., A. Kerkhecker, *A&A* 43 (1997), 137. He is often praised for his support of letters, cf. Theoc. 17, Phylarch. *FGrH* 81 F 40 παιδείας εἴ τινα καὶ ἄλλον καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιμεληθέντα, Ael. *VH* 4.15 ὁ μουσικώτατος, Prol. Com. Anon. Crameri ii (43.4 Koster) φιλολογώτατος, Tzetzes *Prol. com.* (32.5 Koster), see Müller-Graupa, *RE* XVI.1.812.

At a later stage, P. handed over Ptolemy Philadelphus' literary education to Zenodotus, of whom Suid. T. 15 says that τοὺς παῖδας Πτολεμαίου ἐπαίδευσεν. His health might have been frail by then and a succesor was readily at hand. It is not known whether there was some other need for his early return to Cos. A few years later, after the death of Theophrastus (288/7 BC) Strato left Alexandria to take over the Peripatus. Ptolemy would have been nineteen years old, and we hear nothing about a successor of Strato as a royal tutor.

Of all areas affiliated to Egypt Cos, Samos and Cyrene supplied the most input of imported intelligentsia. The Coan contribution was of critical importance. Along with P., Praxagoras of Cos (*c.* 300 BC) is said to have been the 'teacher' of Herophilus, the greatest medic of his times. "We may conjecture that it was the aim of Philadelphus to found a kind of University at Cos, having as its nucleus the Coan school of Medicine, but comprising other faculties" remarked P-H 359–60.[17] The founding of the Museum was an ambitious aspiration of Ptolemy Euergetes which was vigorously pursued by his son and successor. Strabo 13.1.54 says that Aristotle organised the Alexandrian Library, which is factually impossible, but accounts for the role often claimed by later sources for Demetrius of Phaleron, the Peripatetic philosopher and tyrant who had to flee Athens and found shelter in Alexandria after 297 BC to become πρῶτος . . τῶν Πτολεμαίου φίλων (fr. 61). P. and Strato of Lampsacus are often credited with a contribution to the conception of the idea by Ptolemy and then to the first steps in the organisation and establishment of the Library, of which Zenodotus was the first director. The Library scheme must have been discussed some time before its implementation and this may well be true, but in the absence of evidence, one should perhaps not imagine the Coan as the architect of the whole scheme.[18]

---

[17] See also Herzog 199f. ("eine zweite Landesunivestität neben der Akademie von Alexandreia"), Sh-W 102f. On Praxagoras see R. J. Littmann in *ANRW* II.37.3, 2692f.

[18] For a role of P. in the establishment of the Alexandrian Museum see Fraser i, 306f., Bulloch in Easterling-Knox 544, Weber 74f., M. Hose, *Philologus* 141 (1997), 51–2. The political significance of the institution is discussed by P. E. Easterling in Easterling-Knox 29f., A. Erskine, "Culture and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Museum and Library of Alexandria", *G&R* ii 42 (1995), 38–48.

IIIb. *Zenodotus, Hermesianax and Bittis*

The Suidas-entry of Zenodotus (T. 15) calls him μαθητὴς Φιλητᾶ, although the age-gap of the two may have been about ten years. It is not clear where the two met, though Alexandria would be the most likely place. A lot depends on the tantalising (Zenod.) τοὺς παῖδας Πτολεμαίου ἐπαίδευσεν. The plural may be a product of negligence, but it might be meant to include Arsinoe II, the older sister of Ptolemy II born in 316 BC. This might mean that Zenodotus in his youth acted as a royal tutor at the side of P. The latter probably had developed some esteem of the Ephesian, as it is to him that he entrusted — or proposed to be entrusted — the completion of young Ptolemy's education. Zenodotus *Ethnikai lexeis apud* Athen. 7.327b adopted the identification of Cyrenean hyces with erythrinos, as P. fr. 18. The Ephesian produced the first critical edition of Homer and P. occupied himself with Homeric text-criticism. The two are mentioned side by side after Aristarchus by Tzetzes T. 26. Aristarchus' disapproval of Philitan views and his disparaging remarks on Zenodotus' contribution brings P. and Zenodotus closer together. P. may have played a role in Zenodotus' edition, but this was eventually credited to the Ephesian and nothing survives in the Σ to confirm this suspicion. The fact, though, that P.'s Homeric views were still authoritative in Aristarchus' times, so as to provoke the latter's Πρὸς Φιλίταν, might owe a lot to their adoption by Zenodotus. If P. played a role in the establishment of the Library, he might have acted to secure that Zenodotus becomes its first director too.

Hermesianax of Colophon was a member of the immediate circle around P., Σ Nic. T. 16 φίλος τῷ Φιλητᾷ καὶ γνώριμος. In what seems to be an addition to an originally shorter Σ identifying the adressee of Nic.'s *Ther.* with the Colophonian elegist, a commentator supplies the only surviving information about Nic.'s Περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφῶνος ποιητῶν (*FGrH* 271–2 F 10), apparently a treatise dealing with the long tradition of Colophonian poets. Hermesianax was treated in that book (καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ Νίκανδρος μέμνηται τοῦ Ἑρμησιάνακτος ὡς πρεσβυτέρου ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφῶνος ποιητῶν), where his relation with P. could be discussed. φίλος and γνώριμος do not imply a wide age-gap; γνώριμος in such contexts comes close to μαθητής (cf. Plut. *De virt. mor.* 448e ἀντὶ γνωρίμων καὶ μαθητῶν ἐρασταὶ καλούμενοι καὶ ὄντες), but differs from it in the sense that the γνώριμος's relationship with the master is of a more unofficial character.

Hermesianax's interests rank him among those espousing the principles of erudite poetry. He treated common subjects with Theocritus, said to be another disciple of P. Such were cyclops Polyphemus (*CA* 1), centaur Eurytion (*CA* 9),[19] 'bucolic' Daphnis and Menalcas (*CA* 2). In the same spirit, he is interested in epichoric traditions, genealogical relations, cultic aetiology and city-foundation.[20] The stories from *Leontion* summarised in Parth. *Erot. path.* 5, 22 and Anton. Lib. 39 belong to the same context as the episode from P.'s *Hermes* summarised in Parth. *Erot. path.* 2. As P., Hermesianax is attentive to Peripatetic doctrines. He follows their tendency to infer biographical information about authors from their works and his classification of the genres of poetry (epic, elegiac, lyric, tragic) may be of Peripatetic origin too (see Ellenberger in p. 33 n. 26). The catalogue form of *Leontion*, which appeals to Hesiod, had recently gained momentum with Antimachus' *Lyde* and P.'s *Hermes*.

The 98-line-long fragment from *Leontion* (*CA* 7) displays little poetic charisma, but it is highly allusive, as it transforms and combines features from each author's texts (both poets and philosophers) into a novel context. This may be an invaluable witness for the employment of notions of literary criticism which may reflect P. rather than Call., while the choice of authors he treats may again reflect the affiliations and preferences of P.'s circle (on Antimachus see ff.). Note in this respect the praise of Hesiod, Mimnermus and Philoxenus.

Hermesianax's reference to P. (T. 2) yields some information. In terms of vocabulary note that 75–6 Εὐρυπύλου πολιῆται/Κῷοι is a personificated inversion of *Il.* 2.677 Κῶν, Εὐρυπύλου πόλιν, occurring next in Ov. *Met.* 7.363 *Eurypylique urbem, qua Coae . . matres.* πολιήτης is a Homeric hapax (*Il.* 2.806), which is shunned by the erudite poets, but it is part of the vocabulary of contemporary verse-inscriptions.[21] χάλκειον shows that P.'s statue was made, as usual in

[19] Not 'Elegia in Eurytionem' (*CA*), but a reference to Eurytion in an elegiac poem, see Slings 30.

[20] Genealogy: Anton. Lib. 39.2 (*CA* 4.2) γένος δ' ἦν τὸ Νικοκρέοντος ἀπὸ Τεύκρου τοῦ ξυνελόντος Ἴλιον Ἀγαμέμνονι, παρ' ὃ καὶ μᾶλλον ὁ Ἀρκεοφῶν ἐφίετο τοῦ γάμου τῆς παιδός; city-foundation: Parth. *Erot. path.* 5.6 (*CA* 5.6) δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀπολιπὼν τὴν οἰκίαν Θετταλοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν εἰς Κρήτην ἡγήσατο, κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελαθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν προσοίκων εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσίαν ἀφίκετο, ἔνθα χωρίον ᾤκησε τὸ Κρητιναῖον ἐπικληθέν; cult-aetiology: Paus. 7.17.5 (*CA* 8: ancient statue of Athena made by Attes).

[21] Isyll. 21 (*CA* p. 133), 'Simon.' *FGE* 14.1, *GVI* 760.1 (2nd/1st cent. BC), 1001.9 (Rhodes, *c.* 100 BC), 1107.5 (1st cent. BC), 1344.1 (3rd/2nd cent. BC), 1717.5 (Syme, 2nd cent. BC), cf. A.R. 1.867, Posid. *SH* 705.1.

antiquity, of bronze, cf. in Cos *IdC* ED 71f.A.6 (4th cent. BC), nos 58.11 (*c.* 300 BC), 409.6–7 P-H (undated), see Höghammar 69–70. θῆκαν need mean no more than 'erected' (for which usage Hecker's στῆσαν is commoner), as in Call. fr. 85.9 εἰκόν]α σὴν αὐτῇ Λοκρὶς ἔθηκε [πόλ]ις, Aesch. *ScTh* 277 θήσειν τροπαῖα, Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 1381. The verb may imply an official, ceremonial setting up, as it probably was. Kuchenmüller 28 n. 5 (and von Blumenthal 2165) understood that the Coans buried P. and erected a bronze statue at his grave. This would be possible, cf. Anon. *HE* 52.4 Ἴβυκον εὐφύλλῳ θῆκεν ὑπὸ πτελέῃ, Anon. *EG* 898 Kaibel ("Rom. aet.") τοῦτον . . . τύπον ὄρθιον Ἀντωνείνου/Δωρόθεος πτελέῃ θήκατο κρυπτόμενον, but it is not probable, cf. Posid. *SH* 705.17 λαοφόρῳ κείμενος εἰν ἀγορῆι 'situated', not 'buried', see Ll-J ii, 182 *cl. Il.* 2.688 κεῖτο γὰρ ἐν νήεσσι . . Ἀχιλλεύς; also Hdt. 2.130.1 (a gilded wooden cow) κειμένη δὲ ἐν τοῖσι βασιληίοισι ἐν οἰκήματι ἠσκημένῳ, 2.176.2.

For Hermesianax's ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ see on fr. 8. In v. 78 ῥήματα, i.e. poetic vocables or expressions, is what P. studies in Strato T. 4.42–4 ὥστ' ἔδει/τὰ τοῦ Φιλίτα λαμβάνοντα βυβλία/σκοπεῖν ἕκαστον τί δύναται τῶν ῥημάτων, cf. *ibid. PCG* 1.3 (the cook's) καινὰ ῥήματα. λαλίην 'dialect gloss' (cf. Call. fr. 203.17–8 λαλευσ[. . .]. [/Ἰαστὶ καὶ Δωριστὶ καὶ τὸ σύμμεικ[τον with Pfeiffer ad loc.) seems to refer to *At. Gl.*

The form of the name of P.'s alleged mistress is disputed. Cod. *A* of Athenaeus offers Βιττίδα (: Βαττίδα Scaliger), Ovid Tt. 24c, d, offers *Battis* (: *Bittis* Merkel). Athenaeus' preservation of the correct form is secured by two considerations. Firstly, Βαττίς is, generally speaking, possible, but it is unDoric and unattested in any Dorian region or in any of the Aegean islands. The closest parallels are Βάτιχος and Βατιάς in Coan inscriptions of 321–301 BC and *c.* 200 BC respectively, and Βάττος in Samos (*c.* 300 BC). Herodas has Βατυλλίς in 5.70 (Βάτταρος in mimiamb 2 is a foreigner, 2.8, 10–1). The Βιτ- forms are by far more common: Βιττίς occurs in Cos *c.* 200 BC (M. Segre, *ASAA* 25–6 (1963–4), 169 no ix.a.58), Crete (1st/2nd cent. BC), Antip. Sid. *HE* 28.5; Βιττώ in Cos (*GVI* 474.1 of the 1st/2nd cent. BC) and Samos *c.* 300 BC (*CEG* 685.4 and Asclep. *HE* 7.1). In Cos Βίτων occurs 3x in *c.* 300 BC, Βίτταρος 4x in *c.* 200 BC and Βιτίννα in Herodas 5.6, *al.*[22] *Battis* in Ovid's MSS may be a

[22] Further material in *LGPN* i, 100, 102. For the Βιτ- stem, widespread in SE Aegean, see Headlam on Herodas 5.5, L. Robert, *Noms indigènes dans L'Asie-Mineure*

copyist's error due to Callimachus' father *Battus* (*Am.* 1.15.13, *Tr.* 2.367, *al.*).

Secondly, by the most likely identity of Bittis. Kuchenmüller 25f., who believed the correct form to be Βαττίς, considered it as a play *βαττίς = γλῶσσα for a person that never existed.[23] The *opinio communis* takes Hermesianax's words literally: Bittis would be the mistress or wife of P., who composed a poem — or a collection of poems — entitled with her name and dedicated to her, as did Antimachus with *Lyde* or Hermesianax with *Leontion*. Some would like to see this poem as a specimen of Greek 'subjective' elegy,[24] but there is no reliable information about such a poem and P. does not appear anywhere else among enamoured poets. Hermesianax offers no good basis to postulate erotic poetry. As Wil. 1912, 289–90 noted, since Hermesianax wanted to honour the Coan master, he had to present him as being in love. P. appears to be missing in a reference to Clearchus ἐν τοῖς Ἐρωτικοῖς fr. 34 *ap.* Athen. 13.597a, discussing Antimachus' love of Lyde, which is followed by references to Mimnermus and Nanno, Hermesianax and Leontion. In Longus, Philetas is in love not with Bittis, but with Amaryllis, possibly a name originating in the Coan's poetry.

On the other hand, certain considerations would suggest that the proper forum for a Bittis would be the epigram and that she might have been celebrated as an hetaera in some of P.'s epigrams. Asclepiades (see F. Cairns, *Eikasmos* 9 (1998), 165f., D. Magini, *Acme* 53 (2000), 17f.), Philitas of Samos (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 4a), Hedylus of Samos and Posidippus of Pella wrote epigrams on courtesans. This appears to have been a novel trend established by the avant-garde of the genre of which P. was a member. This possibility would gain plausibility by the hetaeric tradition of the name Βιττώ in Hellenistic

---

gréco-romaine, Paris 1963, 235–7, Masson i, 269–83 (esp. 274 n. 33), Fraser ii, 793 n. 29, Latacz 1985, 91 with n. 22 (all going for Βιττίς here).

[23] Von Blumenthal 2166 went one step further: "vielleicht hat Philetas selbst diesen Scherz in einem παίγνιον gemacht". Alfonsi 1943, 162 suggested that her actual name was Βιττίς which the γραμματικοί as a jest changed into Βαττίς before Ovid. The Greeks connected the name Βάττος with βατταρίζειν, see Pfeiffer on Comm. PAntin. (pap. saec. p.C. IV/V) on Call. *HyAp.* 65 (II.48.14).

[24] See for this view Susemihl 176–7, Cairns 1979, 214–30, esp. 220. Those endorsing the supplement γρηῦν] in Call. T. 7a.10 assume a posthumous epicedium for Bittis. G. Coppola, *SIFC* 10 (1933), 330 and P. A. Capra, *Philita poeta d'amore?*, Cagliari 1949, 97–9 were agreed that *Bittis* was a grammatical work in prose by P.; *contra*: L. Alfonsi, *Aegyptus* 29 (1949), 147, see also Boucher 206 n. 4.

epigrams such as Asclep. *HE* 7, Anon. *HE* 38, Antip. Sid. *HE* 43, Βίτιννα in Antip. Sid. *HE* 6.[25] If Asclepiades' courtesan is a non-fictional character, the hetaeric tradition of the name Bitto would have a real basis. Some would identify Βιττοῦν τὴν Γλαύκου appearing in a mutilated sepulchral epigram from contemporary Samos, *CEG* 685 (*c.* 300 BC), with her namesake in Asclepiades. She seems to place a claim for panHellenic fame (v. 2 Ἑλλάδι ἐν εὐρυχόρω[ι), but such an identification remains speculative. It can not be determined whether, on these premises, P.'s Bittis was a real person.

That Hermesianax is at any rate capable of such a distortion is clear by Homer's love to Penelope (27–34) or Philoxenus' to Galateia (69–74), both said to be in love with a character of their poems. Hermesianax's practices are to be examined in relation to a Peripatetic trend to deduce biographical data for poets from their own works. Primary examples of this tendency are Clearchus ἐν Ἐρωτικοῖς fr. 34, Chamaeleon of Heraclea in his various studies on early poets frr. 23f. and Hieronymus of Rhodes frr. 34f.[26] It is in such an ambience that Hermesianax's fragment is quoted in Athen. 13.597af. Within this frame, the Colophonian's reference to a love of apparently his own device may well be inspired by a fictional character Bittis which P. celebrated in his epigrams on courtesans.

Ovid's testimonies for a woman in P.'s life called Battis make use of the distortions appearing in Hermesianax. That part of *Leontion* exercised influence on Roman elegists. Prop. 2.34.27–8 *quid tua Socraticis tibi nunc sapientia libris/proderit aut rerum dicere posse vias?* seems to vary Hermesian. *CA* 7.93–4 (Socrates in love with Aspasia) οὐδέ τι τέκμαρ/εὗρε, λόγων πολλὰς εὑρόμενος διόδους. In *id.* 2.34.45–6 *tu non Antimacho non tutior ibis Homero* the allusion to Homer's and Antimachus' fascination with Lyde and Penelope is indebted to Hermesianax's list (*CA* 7.27–34 and 7.41–6). However, Propertius never insinuates that P. was actually in love with a woman. Following a convention established by him, Ovid consistently claims P. (Tt. 24c,

---

[25] Bowie 83 postulated another Philitan courtesan on the agreement of Prop. 3.15.6 *Lycinna* and Long. 3.15.1 Λυκαίνιον.

[26] The point was made by O. Ellenberger, *Quaestiones Hermesianacteae*, Diss. Gießen 1907, 6–9 and then by Hibges, *RE* VIII.1.826. Recently, by P. Bing, "The *Bios*-Tradition and Poet's Lives in Hellenistic poetry" in R. M. Rosen – J. Farrell (edd.), *Nomodeiktes. Greek Studies in Honor of M. Ostwald*, Ann Arbor 1993, 625f., cf. also Hardie 23, M. di Marco, *DNP* V.433.

d) and Callimachus (Tt. 62–7 Pf.) as erotic poets and in *Rem. am.* 381–2 he implies that the story of Acontius and Cydippe in the *Aet.* frr. 67–75 is an erotic subject, which was for a long time considered as a matter of fact (e.g. by Rohde 1914, 93) until the text itself was retrieved. Ovid is, furthermore, unlikely to have had direct access to either Antimachus' *Lyde*, which became scarce after Agatharchides of Cnidus' epitome in the mid-2nd cent. BC (*FGrH* 86 T 2(3) = Antim. T. 17 Mat., see D. del Corno, *Acme* 15 (1962), 75–6), or to P., although it can not be excluded that he read an (or some) epigram(s) of the latter on Bittis. In T. 24c she and Lyde are paralleled as the beloved ones of other poets. As in Prop. *l.c.* here are at work the references of Hermesianax to Antimachus and Lyde (41–6) and to P. and Bittis (T. 2). Ov. T. 24d keeps to the same line: the word is of women rendered famous by the poetry of their beloved.

Bittis' attribute θοήν has been variously interpreted.[27] P. Maas, *JHS* 52 (1932), 150 related Soph. *Trach.* 857 θοὰν νύμφαν of the adjective applying to young women and regarded it as untranslatable. Its employment here may be a deliberate riddle, which consideration lends colour to A. S. Hollis' suggestion that θοήν could have been discussed in *At. Gl.* (*All. Gramm. Ascr.* Dub. 1). Following the interpretation proposed here, one may raise the possibility that θοήν of a courtesan may imply 'easy, not hard to get' as an equivalent of πρόθυμη. This would perhaps derive some support from Asclep. *HE* 4.1 Ἑρμιόνῃ πιθανῇ . . . συνέπαιζον where the surprising adj. means 'obliging, accommodating', i.e., as the end of the epigram suggests, 'giving in easily' (Cameron 1995, 501).

IVa. *The Coan Statue*

The most important piece of information Hermesianax supplies is the high esteem of the Coan citizens for their native poet. The Coan

[27] Wil. 1912, 289 n. 3 noted that θοήν may be no more than "ein schönes episches Beiwort" but pondered μεγάλη 'tall', an interpretation favoured by G. Giangrande, *EEAth* 26 (1977–78), 114–5. Knox 66 translated 'volatile' (cf. Q.S. 1.706 θοὸς νόος of an undecided mind) and was followed by Cameron 1995, 316. Alfonsi 1943, 164 (= Pfohl 427) took θοήν adverbially seeing a reference to ὀλιγοστιχίῃ ("cantando Bittide in brevi, in corti canti"), but this is far-fetched, see Cameron 1995, 316 n. 73.

demos erected a statue to honour P.[28] A misreading of Hermesianax caused a widespread impression that the statue represented P. singing of Bittis.[29] But μολπάζοντα is to be conjoined with οἶσθα. Its dependence from θῆκαν is unhappy Greek ("οἶσθα τὸν ἀοιδόν ohne Βιττίδα μολπάζοντα ist ja einfach unsinnig", Wil. 1912, 289 n. 4) and misses the point of emphasis in Hermesianax, that P. actually sings of Bittis, not that he was depicted doing so. There is little reason to doubt that the Coan statue of P. would follow the conventions of honorific statues depicting men of letters holding a scroll like the one Posidippus hopes for, *SH* 705.16–7 ε̣ἴοιμι δὲ βίβλο̣ν ἑλίσσων/†ἀμφωι† λαοφόρωι κείμενος εἰν ἀγορῆ̣ι̣. This seems secured by the features of P.'s statue in Alexandria too, Posid. T. 3.4–6. Posidippus wrote his 'Seal' at an advanced age and appealed to the precedent of Archilochus, whom a Delphic oracle demanded to be worshipped, to express the wish for a statue in the market-place of Pella. It would appear that P.'s Coan honours contributed setting a trend for poets to seek public recognition.[30]

Greek cities normally took pride in their poets[31] and statues in honour of poets of the recent or remote past are well-attested. The recognition of P. tells of a society with a literate taste. As Höghammar 78 n. 345 observed, three out of six individuals honoured with statues in Cos were poets (of the rest one was an athlete and two unknown). In the case of P. the Coans would have two motives: the

---

[28] Höghammar studied 97 Coan honorary inscriptions from the 3rd cent. BC to the 2nd cent. AD. Many of these were commisioned by the *demos* (Höghammar 72). Just about the same time the Coans seem to have erected a huge statue of Ptolemy Philadelphus too, see Kabus-Preißhofen, *AA* (1983), 679–84, *id.* 277–9, R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988, 176 tab. 100.

[29] Pohlenz 36, Webster 42, 172 ("a Koan relief [!] of Philitas singing Bittis under a plane-tree"), Bulloch in Easterling-Knox 545 ("a statue of him in characteristic pose"), Knox 66. Wil. 1912, *l.s.* was bitter against this interpretation, cf. also C. Giarratano (*Hermesianactis fragmenta*, Milan 1905) ad loc., Latacz 1985, 86–9 and cf. e.g. Athen. 11.462a οἶδα δὲ καὶ Ἑλλάνικον . . . λέγοντα ὅτι etc.

[30] P.'s statue and Posid.'s 'Seal' are often paralleled to document this fact, cf. M. W. Dickie, *GRBS* 35 (1994), 379–80, Cameron 1995, 67–8, Hollis 1996, 59–61.

[31] Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1398b10f. and the Salmakis-epigram (Halicarnassus, 2nd cent. BC), which contains a catalogue of authors from that city as a reason for pride (43–56). Another inscription of the late Hellenistic era from the same city (*SEG* 36.975.3–8) may even be said to assume a polemic tone with regard to this matter. In general, see G. M. A. Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks* i, London 1965, 4–6 (occasions of erecting a statue), 121f. (statues of poets of the 5th cent. BC), III 224f. (statues of poets of the 4th/3rd cent. BC).

prestigious tutorship of Ptolemy Philadelphus and the celebration of Cos in an acclaimed poem such as *Demeter*. P. would also enjoy the favour of the Coan aristocracy whose pedigree he honoured in that poem. Another reason, albeit uncertain, may be a public office which the Coan might have held to the benefit of his country. Bach 7, 10 misinterpreted Plut. T. 19 to infer that P., when young, held public office in which he failed because of his frail health (as Theages in Plato *Rep.* 496b–c). Couat 71 n. 3 considered such a possibility "improbable itself", but many Hellenistic poets, and indeed those of provincial origin, did not disdain public office. Posidippus and Asclepiades of Samos may have held public office, as a mutilated Delphian proxeny list evidences (*Fouilles de Delphes* iii.3 no 192.9–10).[32] That the Coans knew to appreciate intellectuals with political influence is shown from the honours conferred to Gaius Stertinius Xenophon, the personal doctor of Caesar (see A. Martin, *AC* 65 (1996), 419–20). Two contemporary inscriptions pay tribute to literates who won a competition of an *encomium*-composition to Caesar (nos 66 and 67 in Höghammar's collection). The assumption derives some support from the troubled Coan-Egyptian relations during the Macedonian-Egyptian conflict. After the naval battle of Salamis and the capture of Cyprus in 306 BC Antigonus and Demetrius established thalassocracy in the Aegean. The Coans were forced to adapt and acceded the Macedonian camp. A few made a career in the service of Antigonus. The latter was defeated at Ipsus in 301 BC, but things were volatile until the decisive defeat of Demetrius in 286 BC. Already from 295 BC signs of a renewed Coan rapprochement with the Ptolemies become available. The Coans might have requested P.'s services during this delicate period of their relations with the Ptolemies.[33]

The Coan statue has often been brought into connection with an alleged cult of P. in Cos. In fact, we do not know whether it was erected during P.'s lifetime or after his death. The former is possi-

---

[32] The identification with the poets was proposed by C. Trypanis, *CR* 66 (1952), 67–8 and it is usually accepted as correct, see Hutchinson 265, Ll-J ii, 195, Cameron 1995, 67 who notes that an Asclepiades of Samos appears with Heraclitus of Halicarnassus on a proxeny list of Histiaia of *c.* 266 BC. Fraser ii, 796 n. 45 is sceptical.

[33] On Coan policy during these uneasy times in the Aegean see P-H xxxif., Sh-W 82f., esp. 85f., Rostovtzeff i, 239–40 and in general K. Buraselis, *Das hellenistische Makedonien und die Aegeis*, Munich 1982.

ble for celebrities in advanced age, cf. *Certamen* 302–15 Allen, Posid. *SH* 705.11–7, but the second seems more plausible. Boucher 219–20 corroborated the testimonies of Prop. T. 23f.1 *sacra facit vates* etc., *id.* T. 23e.46 *meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant* and Hermesian. T. 2 to conclude that "on peut penser à quelques cérémonies en l'honneur du grand poète de l'île".[34] Cairns 1979, 220 independently suggested that the statue was "no doubt erected by the citizens in connection with a cult of Philetas". What is meant here is the worship that literary societies offered to poets such as Homer at Smyrna and Chios, Archilochus at Paros, Mimnermus at Smyrna or Hesiod at Thespiae.[35] The statue is compatible with heroic honours (see Ll-J – Parsons on Posid. *SH* 705.16), but it by no means implies them.

IVb. *Claim for Heroic Honours*

It is a higher probability that La Penna 318f. on the strength of Stat. T. 25 postulated a programmatic passage in which P. would hint at heroic honours by his fellow citizens. After La Penna the case for P. coveting heroic honours in his own poetry was argued by Hollis 1996 and by Hardie 33f. on the authority of Prop. T. 23e, Stat. T. 25 and Hermesian. T. 2. Knox 76 contemplated *Demeter* for such a passage; Hardie 26 proposed to identify it as P.'s statue epigram which the poet himself will have written. Hermesianax's reference to the Coan statue of P. and the Propertian 'cultic' references to him would trace their origins to such a passage. As Posid. *SH* 705, Ennius *Var.* 15–6 *aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam:/hic vestrum panxit maxima facta patrum* may envisage the same situation (Hardie 33). La Penna's suggestion seems very possible, but perhaps not "either at the start of a substantial poem, or in a programmatic piece introducing a larger collection" (Hollis), as the context of these

[34] He therefore rendered *sacra* in Prop. T. 23c.1 as "rites sacrés de Philetas", which would allude to the worship granted to P. after his death. *sacra* was interpreted as signifying posthumous cult already by Butler-Barber ad loc., cf. G. Luck, *CQ* n.s. 7 (1957), 177 ("if not officially so, at least in Propertius' imagination") and see Fedeli ad loc. *cl.* Servius on Virg. *A.* 10.519 *inferiae sunt sacra mortuorum.* These scholars identify the place of such a cult as the *nemus* of Prop. T. 23c.2 which, as its attribute *vestrum* shows, should be identical with the *antro* in v. 5 (Fedeli ad loc.).

[35] These are well-attested in Hellenistic times, see Fraser i, 313 with ii, 467 n. 57, Cairns 1979, 218. For statues in the cult of poets see Zanker 1996, 158–66.

references would point towards the Coan *Demeter* (which may be the only poem of P. the Romans would know from Call.), perhaps in a request-section at the end of that poem containing literary declarations in the manner of Call. *HyAp.* 105f. Statius apparently refers to introductory programmatic passages of the poets he mentions (Call., Prop., Ovid and Tibullus), but that prerequisite may be covered by P.'s appearance in the *Aetia*-prologue.

Certain features of this postulated passage might be won from the context of Propertian passages immediately referring to P., esp. T. 23c.9–12:

quo me Fama levat terra sublimis, et a me
nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis,
et mecum in curru parvi vectantur Amores,
scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas.

P. might have expressed his convinction that he initiates a kind of poetry to be followed by others, his wish for the longevity of his work with divine assistance and his hope for public recognition and honours from his compatriots. The motif of posthumous fame constantly goes along with references to P., cf., other than T. 23c.9, *ibid.* 21f. *at mihi quod vivo detraxerit invida turba,/post obitum duplici faenore reddet Honos; /. . ./ maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora venit, id.* T. 23d.17–8 *non hinc ulla tibi speranda est fama, Properti:/mollia sunt parvis prata terenda rotis,* T. 23e.46 *meque deum clament et mihi sacra ferant!.* Posthumous fame would be a subject that would naturally come up in such a passage, cf. Posid. *SH* 705.22–4 οἶμον ἐπὶ Ῥαδάμανθυν ἱκοίμην/δήμῳ καὶ λαῷ παντὶ ποθεινὸς ἐών,/ἀσκίπων ἐν ποσσὶ καὶ ὀρθοεπὴς ἀν' ὅμιλον. For *a me/nata . . Musa* cf. Call. fr. 1.19–20 μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶ̣τε μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδὴν/τίκτεσθαι. Prop.'s winged chariot goes back to Pind. *Pae.* fr. 52h.10–4 (invocation to the Muses εὐμαχανίαν διδόμεν) κελαδι̣ῆσαθ' ὕμ̣νους,/Ὁμήρου [δὲ μὴ τρι]πτὸν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν/ ἰόντες, ἀ[λλ' ἀλ]λοτρίαις ἀν' ἵπποις,/ἐπεὶ αυ[π]τανὸν ἅρμα/Μοισα[(see further Verdenius on *O.* 3.4), then (not winged) Call. fr. 1.25–8 τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι/τὰ στείβε̣ι̣ν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμά/δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους/ἀτρίπτο]υς. The image of a poetic chariot is "commonly depicted in Hellenistic-based artistic representations of Muse and poet, the former standing, the later sitting in the manner of the Homeric *aoidos*" (Campbell 1994, 6). For the chariot lifting the poet's fame to the sky one may recall that in Virg. *E.* 9.27f. Menalcas, in many respects possibly representing

P., is said to have composed a poem on Varus employing this very motif, *Vare, tuum nomen, superet modo Mantua nobis, /. . ./ cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cycni.* Pindaric in its origin is Prop.'s proud statement that other poets will follow his lead, *P.* 4.247–8 μακρά μοι νεῖσθαι κατ' ἀμαξιτὸν . . . καί τινα/οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν· πολλοῖσι δ' ἄγημαι σοφίας ἑτέροις, *O.* 1.116. A revival of this motif may have prompted A.R. to a subversive comparison of the Argonauts drinking from a pure rock-spring with ants blindly following their leaders, 4.1452f. Ovid T. 24d *non/inferius Coa Battide nomen habes* and Philic. *SH* 680.41 οὔποτ' ὀ]λε̣ῖ̣ται (conj. Vogliano) βασ[ί]λεια κρήνη (Bourina?) might as well glance at P.'s claim for enduring fame.

For a possible request for the longevity of P.'s poems one may approach Call.'s request to the Parian Charites for the longevity of his elegies (preceded by a certain allusion to P. fr. 11), *Aet.* fr. 7.13–4 ἔλλατε νῦν,⌋ ἐ̣⌊λέ⌋γ̣ο̣ι̣σ̣ι ⌊δ'⌋ ἐνιψ̣ήσασθ⌊ε⌋ λιπώσ⌊ας/χεῖρ⌋ᾳς ἐμ̣⌊οῖς, ἵνα χεῖρ⌋ᾳς μο⌋ι̣ π̣ουλ̣ὺ̣ μ̣ένωσ̣⌊ι⌋ν̣ ἔτος, cf. A.R.'s address to his heroes at the end of the *Argonautica*, 4.1773–75 ἵλατ', ἀριστῆες, μακάρων γένος, αἵδε δ' ἀοιδαί/εἰς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος γλυκερώτεραι εἶεν ἀείδειν/ἀνθρώποις and see Massimilla 254 for the longevity of this motif in Roman poetry (add Virgil's last eclogue, 10.72 *(Pierides) vos haec facietis maxima*). λιπώ⌊σας/χεῖρ⌋ᾳς may allude to P.'s address to his Nymphs (~ Muses), as these are associated with oil in Theoc. 5.53–4 στασῶ δὲ κρατῆρα . . ./ ταῖς Νύμφαις . . . ἀδέος . . ἐλαίω, where Σ 5.53–4a (167.22 Wendel > Theon fr. *57), comment on the Nymphs' association with oil with reference to Aristotle, ἔλαιον ἐκτίθησι ταῖς Νύμφαις· αὗται γὰρ ἐκθρέψασαι τὸν 'Αρισταῖον ἐδίδαξαν τὴν τοῦ ἐλαίου ἐργασίαν . ., ὥς φησιν 'Αριστοτέλης (fr. 511, *q.v.*). The superstition of the therapeutic θεοῦ χείρ (see J. C. Kosak, *HSCP* 99 (1999), 99f.) would accord with our picture of P. and its employment in Theoc. 10.25 (Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες) ὧν γάρ χ' ἅψησθε, θεαί, καλὰ πάντα ποεῖτε may be indebted to him. Crinagoras relates it to P.'s coeval physician Praxagoras of Cos, *GPh* 51.1–3 (Asclepius) λαθικηδέα τέχνης/ἰδμοσύνην, πανάκῃ χεῖρα λιπηνάμενος,/Πρηξαγόρῃ, στέρνοις ἐνεμάξατο. Ov. *F.* 5.376–8 (at the end of an aetium involving the goddess Flora) *mansit odor: posses scire fuisse deam./floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aevo,/sparge, precor, donis pectora nostra tuis* may suggest that this is what Call. meant here.

The involvement of Cos in such a passage, implied by Stat. T. 25.252 *ipse Coo plaudente Philitas* is expected too, cf. Posid. *SH* 705.16 Πελλαῖον γένος ἀμόν, Prop. 4.1.63–4 *nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris,/Umbria Romani patria Callimachi.* If P. asked for honours from

his compatriots alone, Posid.'s broader claim may be seen as an expanded version, *SH* 705.14–5 ὄφρα με τιμήσω̣σ̣ι̣ Μακηδόνες οἵ τ' ἐπὶ ν̣[ήσων/οἵ τ' Ἀσίης πάσης γ<ε>ίτονες ἠϊόνος. A reference to P.'s opponents in the Pindaric fashion is also conceivable: note the strong wording of Posid. T. 3.4 ἀφ' ἡρώων δ' οὐ̣δ̣ὲν ἔμ̣ε̣ιξ' ἰδέης, the polemic tone of fr. 25 and cf. Prop. 3.1.21f. (quoted above, ~ T. 24c), further Call.'s fictional epitaph *HE* 29.4 ὁ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης, *id.* fr. 1.17 ἔλλετε Βασκανίη̣ς ὀλοὸν γένος, *HyAp.* 113 ὁ δὲ Μῶμος, ἵν' ὁ Φθόνος, ἔνθα νέοιτο, where the Σ Greg. Naz. quoting the line cite a hexameter attributed to 'a wise man', κα]|θώς φησι (καί) τ(ι)ς τ(ῶν) σοφ(ῶν)· '[βα]σ̣κανίης μνημεῖ(ον) [ἀρι]|φραδές (ἐστιν) ὁ μῶμος·' καὶ ὁ Καλλίμαχ(ος) etc.

V. *Theocritus*

Theocritus is referred to as another 'pupil' of P. by his vita T. 14 and Choerob. T. 26. These statements may be mere inferences from a flattering reference to P. in one of Theoc.'s most read poems (T. 5). Vita's ἀκουστὴς δὲ γέγονε Φιλητᾶ καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδου, *ὧν μνημονεύει* gives the game away. Indicatively, Σ 7.40c, d (89.10, 15 Wendel) make Theoc. an ἀκουστής of Asclepiades too. It is improbable that Theoc. met P. in Cos, where perhaps he stayed *c.* 275–270 BC (Gow i, xvii). Internal evidence from Theoc.'s poems, shows that P. exerted a fundamental influence on the Syracusan. Direct echoes of P. in Theoc.'s poetry would include Theoc. 2.120, 3.40f. ~ fr. 27, 7.6f. ~ fr. 6, 7.58 ~ fr. 18, 7.85 ~ fr. 10.2, 7.98 ~ fr. 23.3, 7.138 ~ Hsch. ο 1275 ὀροδεμνιάδες, 7.148 ~ fr. 26?, 10.4 ~ fr. 20.2, 16.32 ~ fr. 25.2, 16.52–3 ~ fr. 3, *Syrinx* 3 ~ fr. 14. Theoc. 10.25 perhaps alludes to P. too. *At. Gl.* may have effected the employment of rare terms in 1.26 ~ fr. 33, 10.44 ~ fr. 46, *HE* 20.3 ~ fr. 30.

Theoc.'s 7th poem will be argued to be his self-styled tribute of honour to P.; the latter's vocabulary and motifs from *Demeter* are echoed, absorbed and transformed to a large extent. At the end of the poem tribute may be paid to his *Hermes* too. Theoc.'s experimental spirit (narrative, bucolic, mimes) and his interest in weird creatures or situations are in accord with the picture we get of P. Theon's commentary on Theoc. would be replete with references to the Coan. Longus, whose *receptio* of P. goes through Theoc., gives P. Amaryllis as a lover (her name implies sparkling beauty, see Hunter

on Theoc. 3.1) and that figure possibly harks back to him, cf., perhaps, Theoc. 4.38–9 ὦ χαρίεσσ' Ἀμαρυλλί, μόνας σέθεν οὐδὲ θανοίσας/λασεύμεθ'. Theoc. 3, which features Amaryllis, may be indebted to P. more than we can verify today, cf. 40–2 of Hippomenes and Atalante ~ fr. 27, 12–3 of a *melissa* in the cave of Nymph Amaryllis ~ P.'s conceivable Nymphs as Melissai ὀροδεμνιάδες. Theoc.'s treatment of magic in the 'Coan' idyll 2 may as well glance at P.'s attention to this subject (frr. 15, 27).

In Theoc. 7.39–41 (T. 5) P.'s alleged superiority is beset with ambiguities. The grasshopper, like the cicada, was considered as a melodic insect (Gow on Theoc. 1.52), but note the double meaning of οὔπω 'not at all' or 'not yet'.[36] κατ' ἐμὸν νόον expresses a subjective truth and may imply some doubt; κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν δόξαν render the Σ ad loc. (89.4 Wendel), cf. Call. *Iambi* fr. 224 τῷ γ' ἐμῷ δόκῳ. The following v. 42 ὡς ἐφάμαν ἐπίταδες ('to suit my purpose', Cholmeley ad loc., see also Dover ad loc. and Segal 169) implies that Simichidas' statement of inferiority is not genuine, but designed to persuade Lycidas to take part in the contest.

Lycidas will be shown to bear features of Demeter's presentation in P.'s poem, which would be unmistakable to the knowledgeable reader. Demeter, in passages closely associated with P., appears as a goddess-patron of poetry supplanting Apollo (see Appendix III). Lycidas' literary messages may as well reflect statements by Demeter which were understood to convey a poetological symbolism. In 45–8 Lycidas makes a statement ranking him to the 'Callimachean' school:

> ὥς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ' ἀπέχθεται ὅστις ἐρευνῇ
> ἶσον ὄρευς κορυφᾷ τελέσαι δόμον Ὠρομέδοντος,
> καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδόν
> ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.

The assumption that the 'Callimachean' ideas were first expressed by P. would gain support from fr. 25 and from Posid. T. 3 as well as from this Theocritean passage.[37] This is formulated on the basis

---

[36] Puelma 1960, 158–9 maintained the traditional interpretation as 'not at all' and after him E.-R. Schwinge, *Philologus* 118 (1974), 50 n. 34 ("überhaupt nicht") and M. van der Valk, *REG* 98 (1985), 139 n. 19. In 7.10 the meaning is 'not yet' and Virg. *E.* 9.35 rendered *adhuc.* It is ambivalent here, see B. A. van Groningen, *Mnemosyne* iv 12 (1959), 26 n. 4, Segal 169 n. 12, M. Fantuzzi in Cambiano 155 n. 27, Cameron 1995, 412.

[37] Hutchinson 202–3 was surely wrong in stripping this passage of its poetological

of Homeric aphorisms — to condemn Homeric emulators — such as *Il.* 9.311–3 (Achilleus to Odysseus: I will speak out) ὡς μή μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος·/ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν,/ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ, or *Od.* 14.156–7. The image of a poet as τέκτων is old, cf. Democr. 68 B 21 D–K, Pind. *P.* 3.113 τέκτων ἐπέων, *al.* (see Nünlist 98f.), Ar. *Ran.* 799–802, *al.*, Call. *Dieg. Iambi* fr. 203.37–8 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῆ σκεύη τεκταινόμενον, Boeo *CA* 2.2, Nicarch. *HE* 3.3. Bird-similes in statements of literary superiority/inferiority were already employed by Pindar in *O.* 2.86–8 or *N.* 3.80–2. Affinities with Pindar are significant: Pindaric images were employed in Callimachean symbolism and P. may have made use of them first. Theoc. often uses images of singing birds to express a poetological contrast, as in 1.136, 5.29, 136–7 and here.

VIa. *The* Aetia*-prologue: Mimnermus, Antimachus and Philitas*

P.'s influence on Call. seems to be pervasive. Even the meagre basis of the extant fragments of P. sufficiently evidences verbal echoes and word-loans. Cf. *Aet.* fr. 7.12 ~ fr. 11, *ibid.* fr. 178.1–2 ~ fr. 17, *ibid.* *SH* 254.4 ~ fr. 14, *HyAp.* 33 ~ fr. 16, *ibid.* 37 ~ fr. 13.1, *ibid.* 56–7 ~ fr. 19, *HyArt.* 47–8 ~ fr. 1a, *ibid.* 244–5 ~ fr. 20, *Hec.* fr. 11 ~ fr. 7, *Sosib. vict.* fr. 384.35 ~ fr. 21.1, Περὶ λογάδων fr. 412 ~ fr. 27, *HE* 65 ~ fr. 18. See also p. 396f. on Call.'s borrowing from the *At. Gl.*

Call. evoked P. in his second *Aetia*-prologue (T. 7a), the polemic tone of which reminds one of Theoc. 7.45–8.[38] The Florentine Scholiast of this passage (T. 7b) understood that the short works of P. and Mimnermus are favourably compared to their long ones. There are difficulties with this interpretation as there is no hint of

meaning; *contra*: G. Zanker, *A&A* 35 (1989), 101–2 with n. 111, see also Papanghelis 42–6.

[38] Cf. Gow i, xxii, Bulloch in Easterling-Knox 576 ("the passage is very similar to the Prologue of the *Aetia* . . . where Callimachus speaks of Homer as the divine king of poetry, not to be imitated . . . and as Theocritus compares cocks crowing and, earlier in l. 41, frogs croaking against the grasshopper, so Callimachus contrasts the braying of the ass with the clear voice of the cicada"). For other correspondences between the *Aetia*-prologue and Theoc. 7 cf. fr. 1.2 ~ Theoc. 7.95 (discussed at p. 63) and see Williams 144–5, S. Goldhill, *ICS* 12 (1987), 1–6 (on σχοῖνος in Theoc. 7.133 and Call. fr. 1.17–8).

discrimination among Mimnermus' or P.'s works elsewhere, nor does the praise of Mimnermus and P. by Propertius, which he apparently inherited from this passage, suggest such a reading. Then the new Posidippus epigram (T. 3) strongly speaks against the Scholiast's understanding. In his description of P.'s statue at the Ptolemaic court Posid. praises the sculptor for creating the statue in a way consonant with P.'s own wishes: ἀφ' ἡρώων δ' οὐδὲν ἔμειξ' ἰδέης,/ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀκρομέριμνον ὅλ[ῃ κ]ατεμάξατο τέχνῃ/πρ]έσβυν, ἀληθείης ὀρθὸν [ἔχων] κανόνα, cf. 2 ἀ]κ[ρ]ιβῆς. Posid.'s description may allude to principles of literary criticism which would rely on P.'s own poetic declarations against long 'heroic' subjects. This agrees with P.'s apparent tendency to ridicule epic heroes, cf. Heracles' proceedings at Pyxa (fr. 16) and the implications about Phlious' effeminacy (fr. 19.2) whom Argonautic epics may have treated in a 'heroic' fashion, or to misuse common epic phraseology, cf. fr. 14. Against the non-heroic appearance of P., Posid. sets a *hapax* characterisation of him heavy with erudition, τὸν ἀκρομέριμνον.[39] P.'s affiliation to learned, attenuated toil known from fr. 25 is here expressly contrasted to the bombastic heroic themes. This reference casts fresh light on the central issue of the *Aetia*-prologue, fr. 1.3–5 εἵνεκε.ν οὐχ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλη[/......]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσα χιλιάσιν/ἢ.....].ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίσσω etc. The possibility that P. ever wrote a 'long' poem against which Call. juxtaposed *Demeter* now becomes highly unlikely. A second consideration may corroborate this conclusion. Theoc. 7 will be shown to rework features from *Demeter* as a hommage to P. The poem ends with references to the hospitalities of Polyphemus to Odysseus and of Chiron to Heracles (148f.) which may as well allude to themes from P., certainly not from *Demeter* (perhaps from *Hermes*). Should this interpretation be true, it would again speak against any discrimination among P.'s poetic output.

Consequently, the comparison seems to be between two different poets and for the second place no one is likelier than Antimachus,

---

[39] In this context the features of P.'s statue alluded to in 3–4 *καὶ με]γέθει κα[ὶ σα]ρκὶ* τὸν *ἀνθρωπιστὶ* διώξας/?γνῶμο]ν' might allude to the size and texture of poetry, as *leptotes*, associated with P. in Call. T. 6, does not refer to the superficial criterium of size alone, cf. the prerequisites of the learned poet in fr. 25.3–4. Posid.'s epigram may allude to features of P.'s poetry also in 1–2 τόνδε Φιλίτα χ[αλ]κὸν *[ἶ]σον κατὰ πάνθ'* Ἑκ[α]ταῖος/... [ἔπλ]ασεν, 5 τὸν ἀκρομέριμνον *ὅλ[ῃ* κ]ατεμάξατο *τέχνῃ* and 10 ἄγκειτ]αι *Μουσέων εἵνεκα* Κῷος ἀνήρ.

see Spanoudakis 2001, 434f. Of the two poets in question only P. may be mentioned by name (9 χῴ Κῷος]?), which might have caused the Florentine Scholiast's misinterpretation. There is a preCallimachean (Peripatetic?) tendency to bracket Mimnermus and Antimachus as an elegiac pair. Aristotle fr. 676 (T. 7 Mat.) and Solinus *Collect. rer. mem.* 40.6 (T. 8 Mat.) *ingenia Asiatica inclita per gentes fuere. poetae Anacreon, inde Mimnermus et Antimachus, deinde Hipponax* etc. ("e fonte ignoto" Mommsen) evidence this tendency. Hermesianax *Leontion CA* 7 interrupts his strict chronological order to place Antimachus (41–6) right after Mimnermus (35–40) as an elegiac pair, and Posid. *HE* 9.1–2 bracketed Antimachus and Lyde with Mimnermus and Nanno. The possibility that Antimachus himself appealed to his compatriot elegist Mimnermus would become certain, if an anonymous elegiac fragment from Herodian comes from his hand, *IEG Fragmenta minus certe ad* Lyden *relata* *192 Μιμνέρμου τοῦ Κολοφωνιακοῦ.[40]

Against this embryonic elegiac pair Call. counter-proposed Mimnermus and P. — and, as the canon of the elegists shows, he eventually succeeded in establishing his new pair. Indicative for P.'s attitude towards Mimnermus may be Hermesianax's perspective. In *Leontion CA* 7.35–6 Hermesianax applies to archaic Mimnermus Hellenistic notions in evaluating poetry:

Μίμνερμος δέ, τὸν ἡδὺν ὃς εὕρετο πολλὸν ἀνατλάς
ἦχον καὶ μαλακοῦ πνεῦμα τὸ πενταμέτρου.

For ἡδύν cf. Call. T. 7a.11 Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς; μαλακοῦ . . . πενταμέτρου implies the identification of this metre as the appropriate means of treating subjects alien to the grand epic. Significantly, Hermesianax applies to Mimnermus the prescription of scholarly toil in composing poetry. In his extant fragment this is paralleled only with P., T. 2.77–8 περὶ πάντα . ./ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλιήν. P. was the first to enunciate the principle of erudition and was particularly attentive to it. Hermesianax's treatment of Mimnermus in these terms may hark back to praise of the latter by P. (the origin of

[40] From Herodian Περὶ τῆς καθολικῆς προσῳδίας *apud* H. Hunger, *JÖByz* 16 (1967), 20 = Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1060 = Antim. Dub. fr. 197. On Antimachus and Mimnermus see M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin-N.Y. 1974, 74–6. The available evidence does not speak against West's hypothesis that Antimachus compiled an edition of Mimnermus' elegies which he entitled *Nanno* after his own *Lyde*, and that it was that edition which was used in Alexandria, cf. also Allen 22.

Mimnermus' 'sweetness'?). In such a case, Call. would rely on P.'s and Antimachus' independent appeals to Mimnermus for his contrasting juxtaposition of the two.

On the slender basis of P.'s and Mimnermus' existing fragments one may surmise that the description of emotions in both may have been expressed in similar terms, cf. Mimn. *IEG* 1.7 αἰεί μιν φρένας ἀμφὶ κακαὶ τείρουσι μέριμναι ~ P. fr. 4.3 ἀμφὶ δέ τοι νέαι αἰὲν ἀνῖαι τετρήχασιν. A further echo may occur in Mimn. *IEG* 1.10 (οὕτως ἀργαλέον) γῆρας ἔθηκε θεός/ ~ P. fr. 23.4 (κακῶν δ' αὖ σοι) μοῖραν ἔνειμε θεός/. A feature in Mimnermus' poetry for which P. is likely to have had especial appreciation is the κόσμος ἐπέων of his verses, as manifested in the sonority of e.g. *IEG* 2.1 *φύλλα φύει πολυάνθεμος*, *IEG* 2.2 *ὅτ' αἶψ' αὐγῇς αὔξεται* or in the disposition of the endings of *IEG* 2.1–3 ὥρῃ/ἠελίου/ἥβης and *ibid.* 7–9 ἥβης/ἠέλιος/ὥρης. P. himself was fond of such practices.[41] In the immediate environment of P., Asclep. *HE* 2.3 ἐν ζωοῖσι τὰ τερπνὰ τὰ Κύπριδος may glance at Mimn. *IEG* 1.1 τί δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χρυσέης Ἀφροδίτης; and Hermesian. *CA* 7.1 φίλος υἱὸς *ἀνήγαγεν Οἰάγροιο at Mimn. *IEG* 11.1 μέγα κῶας *ἀνήγαγεν αὐτὸς Ἰήσων. The fact that Mimnermus and P. are placed side by side in the canon of the elegiac poets may not be decisive in this respect, as this may be due to the influence of Call.

The easy conclusion that P. turned against Antimachus, whom Call. and his Roman followers accused of treating heroic subjects, ought to be dealt with caution, as at least some of the critics said to oppose Call. in the Florentine Σ show an undisturbed affection for both Antimachus and P. Asclep. *HE* 32 praised *Lyde* and is at the same time mentioned in one breath with P. in Theoc. T. 5. Posid. *HE* 9 praised Antimachus as well as writing T. 3 on P. Hermesianax is not named among the Telchines, but he too handled both Antimachus and P. in *Leontion.*[42] It is Call. who praises P. (Tt. 6, 7), but rejects Antimachus (frr. 398 and 589).

---

[41] Further on sound-patterns in Mimnermus see D. Donnet, *AC* 64 (1995), 264–5. For a discussion of possible links between Mimnermus and P. cf. Szádeczky-Kardoss 157f.

[42] Hermesianax might at least be aware of antiAntimachean criticism. In *CA* 7.45–6 γόων δ' *ἐνεπλήσατο* βίβλους/*ἱράς* ('big'?) there may lurk a hint at Antimachus' *πολυστιχίη*. For other possibilities see P. Cobiliri, *A Stylistic Commentary on Hermesianax*, Amsterdam 1998, 129.

The above *caveat* should not be taken to imply that there is evidence or indications for surmising a close relation between Antimachus and P. The Coan seems to have taken a substantially different approach with regards to the rejuvenation of epic and renounced the heroic themes. The employment of pentameter for narrative is obviously a point of contact, but it can not be regarded as self-sufficient. The *Lyde* was a catalogue-poem and P.'s *Hermes* may have been such a poem, but, to judge by the one story known from it from Parthenius (fr. 1), it was sketched with a lighter and more cheerful tone, whereas *Lyde*'s content is said by Hermesianax to be pessimistic, *CA* 7.45–6 (T. 11 Mat.) γόων δ' ἐνεπλήσατο βίβλους/ἱράς. Above all, *Hermes*, although written in hexameters, seems to have treated its subjects in a light, 'unheroic' way, whereas *Lyde* is said by [Plut.], who apparently reflects older literary debate, to have recounted heroic misfortunes, *Cons. Ap.* 106c (T. 12 Mat.) ἐξαριθμησάμενος τὰς ἡρωικὰς συμφοράς. Both Antim. and P. treated facets of the Argonautic expedition, but the different localisations of Jason and Medea's wedding (at the river Phasis in *Lyde* fr. 75, in Alcinous' palace in P. fr. 22) may only be the peak of the iceberg in a widely differing handling. The juxtaposition of P./Bittis and Antim./Lyde in Ov. T. 24d is an Ovidian fallacy stemming from Hermesianax. Antim., in the second book of *Lyde* fr. 85, refers to the colonisation of Cnidus by Thessalians leaving the Dotian plain, an ancient cult-centre of Demeter. The reference is very probably linked with the establishment of Demeter's cult in the SE Aegean, cf. Steph. Byz. 256.14 s.v. Δώτιον. P. fr. 15 Θεσσαλαί alludes to the same event, but the point of emphasis lies elsewhere and either fragment is transmitted by different sources and for different purposes. Antim. *Lyde* fr. 78 (cf. also fr. 79) ἔνθα Καβάρνους θῆκεν ἀγακλέας ὀργειῶνας treated the visit of Demeter to Paros and the establishment of her cult there. Paros is mentioned as one of Demeter's principal cult-centres in the *HHD* 491, cf. also Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 89. Demeter's visit to Cos was the subject of P.'s *Demeter*, but the motif is so widespread that its employment here could hardly be considered as significant. A predilection that both poets certainly share is their tendency for apocopes: Antim. fr. 145 has ἄλφι for ἄλφιτον, fr. 97 λαχμόν for λακτισμόν (see further Matthews 57(c)), P. fr. 5 αἰδῶ for αἰδῶς, fr. 17 ἔρι for ἔριον. No connection can be substantiated from Antimachus' alleged employment of the Cyrenean word ὕκης and P. fr. 18, as the dactylic fragment containing this word probably comes from the comic poet Antiphanes.

VIb. *Callimachus'* Somnium *and fr. 532 (T. 6), the* Pinakes *and the Elegiac Canon*

P.'s presence in the second *Aetia*-prologue may suggest his corresponding presence in the *somnium*-prologue as well.[43] *Demeter* had a strong aetiological tinge and could be evoked in terms of form and content, but the available material hampers firm conclusions on this matter. Some correspondences which might hark back to P. may, though tentatively, be pointed out. As in fr. 1.6, so a child seems to figure in fr. 2a.61 ἐγκ[ο]λπι[, 62 γόνῳ μ[, which someone (the Muses?) may take to their bossom, as Demeter perhaps did with a child in Chalcon's palace (see p. 263 and note *HHD* 238 (Demeter of Demophon) ἐν κόλποισιν ἔχουσα). That same Philitan child may lie *in oppositione* behind the poetological metaphor of the omnivorous 'infant' Erysichthon in the *HyDem.* Honey from, or bees on Hymettus, considered as their place of origin, are alluded to in fr. 2a.49 Ὑμησσοῖ (see p. 304 on Nic. *Alex.* 446) and in fr. 2.5 Μουσέων ἑσμόις, cf. Philic. *SH* 680.52 γυναικῶν . . . ἑσμός of Demeter's initiates. Bees/honey appeared in *Demeter* fr. 14 and so did, probably, Coan Nymphs as Melissai ὀροδεμνιάδες. To these may refer the ἀπαλαὶ . ./?νήνιες] in Call. fr. 1.11–2. The fact that these Nymphs/Melissai (if the allusion is to them) teach that Mimnermus is γλυκύς would wittily make a honey-sweet point. Call. fr. 2a.64 δαίσατε and 2a.65 πανθοιν[seem to envisage a celebration with a profuse banquet (by the Muses?, cf. N. Natalucci in I. Andorlini, *al., Atti del XXII Congr. Intern. di Papirologia* ii, Florence 2001 [1998], 1028f.) Chalcon offered one to Demeter (though there are other possibilities too). Lastly, Hippocrene is referred to as παρ' ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου in fr. 2.1 = 112.6. Hippocrene was brought into association with Bourina, which has been argued to derive its name from the alleged imprint (ἴχνος) of Chalcon's knee on the protruding rock from which it sprang.

Of greater importance is Call.'s invocation to the Parian Charites in fr. 7.11–4:

ἐν δὲ Πάρῳ κάλλη τε καὶ αἰόλα βεῦδε' ἔχουσαι
. . . . . ἀπ' ὀστλίγγων δ' αἰὲν ἄλειφα ῥέει

[43] For correspondences between the two prologues including verbal reminiscences see Kambylis 89f., Cl. Meillier, *REG* 92 (1979), 164f. (= *ZPE* 33 (1979), 39f.), E. Livrea, *Hermes* 123 (1995), 47–62, Cameron 1995, 129f. (the *Prologue* not a later addition, but an original "aetion of the *Aetia*"), Massimilla 237.

ἔλλατε νῦν,⌋ ẹ⌊λέ⌋γọιṣι ⌊δ'⌋ ἐνιψῄσασθ⌊ε⌋ λιπώσ⌊ας
χεῖρ⌋ạς ἐμ̣⌊οῖς, ἵνα μο⌋ị π̣ουλ̣ὺ μ̣ένωσ̣⌊ι⌋ν̣ ἔτος.

These lines come from the first aetium of the *Aetia*, but the address to the Charites shows their essential association with the dream-prologue, where the Muses were invoked (fr. 1a.12f. = fr. 2 Massim.). Here motifs from P. acquire a poetological symbolism and appear applied to creatures with an apparent literary function.[44] The Charites are wearing charming thin dresses (κάλλη τ⌋ε καὶ αἰόλα βεύδε'), which is the feature of Coan vests with which Call. T. 6 may have compared *Demeter*. Demeter herself is εὔπεπλος in Theoc. 7.32, as is Mnemosyne in Pind. fr. 52h.13. For weaving Charites (as if Nymphs) cf. A.R. 4.424f. regarding a πέπλος they weaved for Dionysus in Naxos. Their tresses drop unction, a motif employed again by Call. of Apollo in *HyAp.* 38f. In his commentary on fr. 7.12 Theon apparently associated ὀστ⌋λ̣⌊ί⌋γγων with P. fr. 11 ἄστλιγγας (possibly dropping unguent aroma too). The association of Charites and Muses is traditional and recurs in the *Aetia*-epilogue, fr. 112.2, 5. Charites and Apollo appear together in Call. fr. 114.9 σὰς⌋ ἰδανὰς Χάριτας. The description is followed by a request for longevity which, as it has been argued, might be indebted to the concluding section of *Demeter*.

Call. did not appeal to P. for the first time in the *Aetia*-prologue. In T. 6 τῷ ἴκελον τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κῷον Call., as O. Schneider suggested, seems to compare the Coan γράμμα with the celebrated Coan vests.[45] The description of the work as τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κῷον fits the content of *Demeter* and the comparison with the *leptotes* of a Coan

---

[44] Call. could have been reminded of P. because of the contrasting situations. Minos learns about the loss of his son Androgeos and conducts the celebration of Charites without garlands and piping, fr. 3. It is with these means that Chalcon tries to console Demeter afflicted with the loss of her daughter. On the poetological significance of this fragment and its relation with *HyAp.* 38–41 see G. Massimila, "L'invocazione di Callimaco alle Cariti nel primo libro degli *Aitia* (Fr. 7, 9–14 Pf.)" in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists*, Copenhagen 1994 [1992], 322–5.

[45] It is misleading to use the *Aetia*-prologue as a pilot for interpreting T. 6. M. Pohlenz, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 317f. thought that T. 6 comes from an earlier version of the *Aetia*-prologue. G. Vitelli, *BSAA* n.s. 8 (1933), 142 suggested that the comparison is with τῷ τοῦ Μιμνέρμου γράμματι. Puelma 1957, 97f. (*Labor et Lima*, 183f.) assumed that fr. 398 against Antimachus and T. 6 belong to the same epigram. Wholly unconvincing is Knox's 68 interpretation that T. 6 is a polemical reference to P. on the grounds that γράμμα was a term employed against Antimachus in fr. 398. Cameron 1995, 319–20 took it up to identify the Coan γράμμα with *Bittis*.

vest may be suggested by the Coan Nymphs possibly weaving such fabric in their cave, see p. 266f. and cf. Call. *HyAp.* 57 αὐτὸς δὲ θεμείλια Φοῖβος ὑφαίνει, Theoc. 7.8 (poplars and elms around Bourina) εὔσκιον ἄλσος ὕφαινον, then Theoc. 1.52–3 (a young boy weaving an ἀκριδοθήρα). The 'weaving' of poetry is a favourite motif of Pindar (Braswell on *P.* 4.275, Nünlist 110f.) and Call. is fond of it (Pfeiffer on fr. 520, D. L. Selden, *ClA* 17 (1998), 303–4), but here it seems to go back to features of P.'s own poetry. And Call.'s is undoubtedly a very 'Coan' comparison.[46] It may be on this Callimachean passage that the Romans drew the widespread motif of luxurious, attenuated Coan vests, which in Prop. is compared in at least two cases (T. 23a) with the composition of verse.[47] It is perceptible, as Wimmel suggested, that this reference to P. comes from an epigram.[48]

P. was also included in the canon of the elegiac poets (Procl., Can. Byz., Tzetzes[49] T. 18, Quint. T. 19) and that must have happened at a time in which his elegiac poems were read and appreciated. It is a fair assumption that Call.'s *Pinakes* played an important role in this process. The *Pinakes*, as a classified directory of all extant literature, was used as a guide for the selection of some canonical authors. Call.'s determination to replace the pair Antim./Mimn. with

Sbardella 114–5 posited that the reference is to a postulated *ktisis*-poem lurking in the gap of Call. T. 7a.10 Κῶν].

[46] The Coans claimed to have introduced sericulture into Greece, cf. Arist. *HA* 551b16 πρώτη δὲ λέγεται ὑφῆναι ἐν Κῷ Παμφίλη Πλάτεω θυγάτηρ, Pliny *NH* 11.76. Cos enjoyed the monopoly of silk-production in the Aegean, cf. Theoc. 2.73 βύσσοιο καλὸν . . χιτῶνα and see Sh-W 242, 378f., Craik 20. Thin vests are a feature of Coan sculpture, see H. Weber, "Coae vestes", *MDAI* 19–20 (1969–70), 249–53, Kabus-Preißhofen 142f., further G. M. A. Richter, "Silk in Greece", *AJA* 33 (1929), 27–33, Davies-Kathirithamby 112–3.

[47] Prop.'s direct source seems to be the passage containing Call. T. 6, see Heyworth 209–10. Hunter 1983, 124 n. 91 noted that Prop. T. 23a constitutes "almost certainly a reference to Philetas", R. F. Thomas in Harder 1993, 198 that it "might suggest a greater programmatic importance". An independent employment of this motif applied to Lysias' delicate style occurs in Plut. *De aud.* 42d ἐν τρίβωνι Λυσιακοῦ λόγου λεπτῷ καὶ ψιλῷ. The Coan vests became a topos in Roman verse, cf. Prop. 4.2.23 *indue me Cois, fiam non dura puella*, Tib. 2.3.53–4 *illa gerat vestes tenues quas femina Coa/texuit, auratas disposuitque vias* and see Butler-Barber on Prop. 2.1–2, Pfeiffer on fr. 532 *cl.* Hsch. κ 4794 κῷον· . . . ἱμάτιον, and the passages gathered in P-H xlvif., Sh-W 382–3.

[48] Wimmel 1958, 348. Schneider ad loc. and G. Knaack *apud* Susemihl i, 178 n. 2 thought of *Grapheion*, which Knaack seems to believe consisted of literary epigrams.

[49] Tzetzes T. 18c — κατὰ στοιχεῖον?

that of P./Mimn. shows in the *Aetia*-prologue. The reduction of the elegiac canon can be dated with reasonable confidence to the period not long after Call.'s death, at the early 2nd cent. BC. Lightfoot 89–91 argues that to some extent Parthenius may have later replaced P. in the elegiac canon.

VII. *Relations with Contemporary Poets*

P. may have especially interacted with the scholars and poets of the SE Aegean. In Cos he was venerated. Coan Xenocritus' first ever Hippocratic lexicon may well be due to his influence. P. is mentioned in one breath with Asclepiades in Theoc. T. 5. Asclepiades was a slightly younger contemporary of P. (*c.* 330–260 BC)[50] and had close ties with Posidippus, the author of T. 3. He might have led the School of Literature at Samos and seems to have been a respected figure and to have developed ties with the local aristocracy (*HE* 44 concerns a ring belonging to a Queen Cleopatra). He therefore appears to be the Samian analogue of the Coan. In the field of the epigram his influence was decisive. What we have of him may, though, be but a fraction of his extensive output, as he is known to have composed in various metres (Hutchinson 264 n. 80). He influenced Call. and Theoc. and interacted with local poets.[51] In Appendix III the possibility that Asclepiades along with Posidippus and Hedylus published *Soros* as a posthumous dedication to P. is discussed. Cos and Samos had developed a close relationship at that time (see *SEG* 39.850, Herodas 2.73 with Cunningham ad loc.) and the relationship of Asclep. and P. may have been part of it.

Simias of Rhodes is first a γραμματικός, then a poet. Simias took the *At. Gl.* into consideration. He experimented with various metres and is often quoted by Hephaestion. His *Apollo* seems to have been a catalogue-poem, in which the principle of recondite, exotic stories built around a god may be indebted to P.'s lead with *Hermes*. However,

[50] On Asclep.'s dates: T. B. L. Webster, *WS* 76 (1963), 74–5, *HE* ii, 114–5, Bulloch 40, Hutchinson 264–6, Cameron 1995, 237–9, Gutzwiller 1998, 122f.

[51] Asclep. and Call.: Fraser i, 563, 584f., 594f., Schwinge 26. For Asclep. and Theoc. cf. the Asclepiad metre of poems 28 and 30 and see Hunter 1996, 19–20. Interaction with local poets: Asclep. *HE* 19.1–2 πρόσθε μοι 'Αρχεάδης ἐθλίβετο, νῦν δέ etc. ~ Simias *HE* 3.1–3 πρόσθε μὲν ἀγραύλοιο . . . αἰγός/†δοιὸν ἐπὶ χλωροῖς ἐστεφόμαν πετάλοις†/νῦν δέ etc. Asclep. *HE* 28 is a laudatory epigram on Erinna's *Distaff*. There is a flattering reference to him in Hedylus *HE* 6.4.

his verses, though replete with erudition, seem artificial and lack the grace of the Coan.

Aratus' *lives* T. 17 associate him with P. Call. in his antiPeripatetic Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην (fr. 460) praised Aratus as πολυμαθῆ καὶ ἄριστον ποιητήν, and Aratus wrote verses on a wide range of topics including medical poems (*SH* 92–8), a collection Κατὰ λεπτόν (*SH* 108–9) and *Paegnia* (*SH* 111). He is particularly associated with the notion of *leptotes*[52] and can be said to belong to the 'school' of P. Leonidas of Tarent is commonly believed to have visited Cos on the authority of a lively epigram describing the *Aphrodite Anadyomene* of Apelles (*HE* 23). His humble-folk themes may owe something to P. Euphorion, who developed an individual poetic style, is said by Crates T. 8.3–4 to be attentive to glosses, a subject pioneered by P., τὰ Φιλίτα/ἀτρεκέως ᾔδει. His imitation of fr. 23 in Ἐπικήδειον εἰς Πρωταγόραν *CA* 21 demonstrates that he took account of P.'s poetic work as well, cf. also fr. 26 and nn. on frr. 4.3a, 5a, 21.1c. Euph.'s residence in Athens may have facilitated his interest in P.

Alexander of Aetolia is also said by the *lives* of Arat. T. 17 to have been a contemporary of P. This synchronisation is inaccurate but it suggests a liaison. Alexander was born in *c.* 315 BC and was active in Alexandria during the reign of Philadelphus, whence he moved (*c.* 270 BC), along with Aratus and Antagoras, to the court of Antigonus Gonatas in Pella.[53] In *CA* 7.1 he may borrow the Doric term χᾳός (of Anaxagoras) from P. and in *CA* 3.11 Ἀνθεὺς Ἑρμείῃ ταχινῷ φίλος he may allude to *Hermes*. In *CA* 5.4 (parodist Boeotus) Μιμνέρμου δ' εἰς ἔπος ἄκρον ἰών he mentions Mimnermus close to terminology which is brought in association with P. The *lives*' references might by due to Alexander's *Musai*, an elegy which handled poets possibly in the style of Hermesianax. The two poets of whom we hear in that poem are near-contemporaries and enjoyed public recognition: Timotheus in *CA* 4, invited by the Ephesians to honour the millenium of the local temple of Artemis with a hymn in return for a generous compensation, and the Syracusan parodist Boeotus in *CA* 5, the quotation of which is introduced by Athen.

---

[52] Cf. the acrostich λεπτή in *Phaen.* 783–7 and Call. *HE* 56.3–4, Leon. Tar. *HE* 101.1–2, 'Ptolemy' *SH* 712. See further Kidd 36–7.

[53] Testimonia *apud* Alex. Aet. *TrGF* 101, Magnelli 85f. On his life and dates see Meineke 215–6, Fraser ii, 649, Ll-J in *Studi Gigante*, 379, K. Dover, ³*OCD*, 60, Lightfoot 460 n. 206, Magnelli 9f.

15.699c with ὅτι δ' ἦν τις περὶ αὐτοὺς (sc. παρῳδούς) δόξα παρὰ τοῖς Σικελιώταις Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλὸς . . . ποιήσας ἐλεγεῖον τρόπον τοῦτον δηλοῖ etc. If contemporary reputation and posthumous fame were the driving motif of the *Musai* (see Magnelli 21f.), as love in Hermesianax's *Leontion*, P. could have a place in that peculiar literary history. Cf. that the treatment of Hermesianax in Nicander's Περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφῶνος ποιητῶν provoked their faulty association in Σ Nic. T. 16.

VIII. *Treatment of Literary Past: Hesiod, Pindar, Philoxenus*

Other than Mimnermus and Antimachus discussed above, P.'s reception of three poets of the past deserves attention. First, Hesiod, who was appreciated for his versatility and erudition in many subjects, both features in the taste of P. He is described as πάσης ἤρανον ἱστορίης in Hermesian. *CA* 7.22 and he is praised by Call. *HE* 56.1. His discontinuous *Catalogue of Women* enjoyed particular popularity. As the ancestor of the Hellenistic *Kollektivgedicht* that poem had some effect on *Hermes* in terms of form.[54] The gnomic fr. 5 from this poem has a Hesiodic ring. P. might have reviewed the *Catalogue of Women* also in fr. 27 for the canonical version of the Atalante-myth. The treatment of Mestra as a Thessalian pharmakis and references to Coan subjects in the *Catalogue* rebound in P.'s novel treatment of them (frr. 15, 21). For the proceedings around Bourina P. might have paid attention to the incidents around Hesiodic Hippocrene. The proem of the *Theogony* may have had a broader impact on the treatment of the Coan Nymphs by P. than we can tell today.

Then comes Pindar, a poet who talked in many different ways about his art. In the discussion of *Demeter*'s possible influence it will be argued that many of Call.'s poetological images which are thought

---

[54] This form of poetry was considered as Hesiodic *par excellence*. Zenodotus, for example, obelised the list of Nereids in *Il.* 18.39–49 ὡς Ἡσιόδ<ε>ιον ἔχων χαρακτῆρα (Σ A ad loc., IV.433 Erbse). For an account of the *Catalogue*'s influence on Hellenistic poets see J. Schwarz, *Pseudo-Hesiodea*, Paris 1960, 585–9, J. J. Clauss, "Hellenistic Imitations of Hes. *Catalogue of Women* fr. 1.6–7 MW", *QUCC* n.s. 36 (1990), 129–40. On the Hellenistic popularity of catalogue-poetry with mythological exempla see M. Fantuzzi, *PCPS* 41 (1995), 35 n. 86, Cameron 1995, 380–6, Lightfoot 24f. For the authenticity of the poem see P. Dräger, *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods*, Stuttgart 1997, 1f., N. J. Richardson, *CR* n.s. 50 (2000), 263–4.

to hark back to Pindar, may in fact allude to *Demeter*. This means that P. consciously absorbed and refined Pindaric images in his own poetry, such as the road-image (στενωπός in P., see p. 229), the water-image (ὀλίγη λιβάς of Demeter in Call. *HyAp.* 112) or the bee-image. Other symbolic Pindaric motifs too may have appeared in P., such as the poetic chariot leading the *turba*, the mixing of wine and the 'weaving' of verses. Note in particular that at the outset of *Demeter* P. varies Pind. *Hymn to Persephone* fr. 37. *Demeter* at some point may have reproduced the sacramental atmosphere of Pindar's poetry. In several cases bold Pindaric expressions can be paralleled with Philitan ones, see e.g. frr. 4.2c, 9.2d, 13.1a, e. P.'s pupil, Zenodotus, produced a recension of Pindar's work.

Thirdly, Philoxenus may deserve special mention; he was a reputed poet of dithyrambs who according to his Suidas-life (φ 393) died in Ephesus. In the celebrated *Cyclops* or *Galateia PMG* 815f. he treated Cyclops in a novel way by representing him in love (*PMG* 817, 821) and eating herbs (*PMG* 820). The dreadful hospitality he offered to Odysseus has a grotesque touch (*PMG* 818, see J. H. Hordern, *CQ* n.s. 49 (1999), 445f.) and may have affected P.'s conceivable treatment of monstrous creatures as hosts, such as Pholus, Chiron or Cyclops himself. Philoxenus' association with P. is suggested by their bracketing in Hermesian. *CA* 7.69f. and perhaps by Philoxenus' influence on Theoc. Hermesianax places Philoxenus together with P. as the last of his six pairs of poets on the grounds of, I think, advocating a new kind of poetry with innovative treatment of sub-heroic themes.[55] Compare in this respect P.'s relationship with the Muses with Philoxenus' association with the Muses as his foster sisters in Hermesian. *CA* 7.69f. and Machon 79–80. These passages may suggest a literary manifesto by Philoxenus and may place him directly in the literary ancestry of Call., see Hardie 31, F. Cairns, *ZPE* 130 (2000), 9–11. An early anthologist may have placed Philoxenus and P. together: in Phot. T. 18a they appear side by side as anthologised by Stobaeus.

[55] Hermesianax's previous five couples have mostly a generic affinity: two legendary figures (Orpheus and Musaeus), two epic poets (Hesiod and Homer), two elegiac (Mimnermus and Antimachus), two lyric (Alcaeus and Anacreon) and two tragic (Sophocles and Euripides). For Philoxenus as innovator cf. [Ar.] *PCG* fr. dub. 953, Antiphan. *PCG* 207.2–3 ὀνόμασιν/ἰδίοισι καὶ καινοῖσι χρῆται πανταχοῦ, [Plut.] *Mus.* 1142c Φιλοξένου δὲ καὶ Τιμοθέου . . καὶ τούτων αὐτῶν τὰ ποικιλώτατα καὶ πλείστην ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔχοντα καινοτομίαν.

IX. *Comic* leptotes

In a number of testimonies (Suid. T. 1, Plut. T. 20, Athen., Ael. 21–22) P. is described as ἰσχνός or λεπτότατος. It seems that he was one of the intellectuals derided for their slenderness in Middle comedy, in which P. featured, albeit for a different reason, in Strato T. 4.[56] Ael. T. 22b ἐκωμῳδοῦντο εἰς λεπτότητα gives the source of this feature away (on ἐκωμῳδοῦντο *et sim.* see the *Index* in *PCG* viii, 521). Aelian's passage is directly indebted to Ar. *Gerytades* fr. 156 (among ᾳδοφοῖται 'people on the verge of death') πρῶτα μὲν Σαννυρίων/ ὁ τῶν τραγῳδῶν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν τραγικῶν χορῶν/Μέλητος, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κυκλίων Κινησίας. The addition of P. to this list suggests that the source of Aelian (or of Athenaeus) is aware of a comic passage in which P. too was mocked for the same reason as his emaciated predecessors. Aelian may draw on Athenaeus, but as he took a particular interest in Attic things of the 5th and 4th cent. BC, he may independently draw on the same source as him.[57] No need for emendation arouses by the fact that in a comic passage P. appeared as ποιητὴς ἑξαμέτρων (Ael. T. 22b). The alleged weights on P.'s feet (μολίβου . . πεποιημένα εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς ὑποδήμασι πέλματα) is not a later biographical fiction, but part of this same treatment of P. in comedy. Athen. T. 21 goes on with a similar precaution taken by the seer Archestratus, which may have its credentials in comedy (Adesp. *PCG* *122) and similarly Athen. 12.551d explains Ar. *Av.* 1378 φιλύρινον Κινησίαν as διὰ τὸ φιλύρας λαμβάνοντα σανίδα συμπεριζώννυσθαι, ἵνα μὴ κάμπτηται διά τε τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὴν ἰσχνότητα.

Plut. T. 20 shows that comic mockery rendered P. a famous valetudinarian. His frailty is paralleled with Prodicus'. Prodicus is described

---

[56] On the question see *in primis* Cameron 1991, K-A on Adesp. *PCG* *122. The comic motif is illustrated in Athen. 12.551a–552f. On meagre intellectuals in art see Zanker 1996, 102f., 122f. It was later employed by Lucillius *AP* 91f. in lusory epigrams εἰς λεπτούς, whence Kayser 21 suggested that this might be the source of P.'s feature. So did Bach 8 n. 11, F. J. Brecht, *Motiv- und Typengeschichte des griechischen Epigrams*, Leipzig 1930, 91–3, E. Reitzenstein in E. Fraenkel, *al.* (edd.), *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein*, Leipzig-Berlin 1931, 34 n. 3, Müller 1987, 40 with n. 133. It is only as a curiosity that the view C. Fries, *PhW* 18 (1938), 511–2 is worth mentioning: P.'s slenderness has a Sanskrit-background with hermit Muni in Rigved 10.136, who is able to fly in the air. The belief would creep into Greece through Hellenistic syncretism.

[57] Crates of Mallos' pupil Herodicus (Athen. 13.586a, 591c — in at least six books) and Aristarchus' pupil Ammonius (Σ Ar. *V.* 1289) produced works on κωμῳδούμενοι. If at all, the former's candidacy is likelier here.

as wrapped in blankets with frail health in Plato *Prot.* 315c–d, but Pfeiffer 1968, 41–2 may be right in suggesting that Plut. has in mind a comic treatment of ailing Prodicus too. Modern scholars used to attribute this feature of P. to the principle of *leptotes*,[58] which in the light of the evidence adduced above seems misleading. In some cases, though, comic features rely on facts of reality such as P.'s meagre physical appearance implied in Posid. T. 3, or earlier literary references such as the one to Prodicus in Plato. The application of comic slenderness to P. may have been facilitated by his pronouncement of literary 'slenderness', to which the description of his unheroic, 'human' statue in Alexandria by Posid. T. 3 may as well be indebted.

A by-product of P.'s handling in comedy is the fictitious epitaph about his death quoted by Athen. T. 21 (πρὸ τοῦ μνημείου αὐτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα). This derisory couplet was written by a contemporary familiar with the mockery of Middle comedy about the Coan. It combines P.'s renowned industry (νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἑσπέριοι) with his wasting himself to his death trying to solve Eubulides' logical riddle of ψευδόμενος λόγος.[59]

Xa. *Survival*

Nicanor of Cos, apparently a local grammarian, is attested by Σ Theoc. T. 13 to have written a commentary on *Demeter*, which was accessible to Theon in Alexandria.[60] A lot, if not all, of the authoritative information on *res Coae* in the Σ on Theoc. 7 may derive their origin in his commentary. Nicanor is undatable, but Theon offers a

---

[58] Boucher 212 n. 2, E. C. Dodra, "Ateneo y la λεπτότης de Filetas", *Emerita* 67 (1990), 125–9, Gutzwiller 1991, 204 n. 14, see Cameron 1995, 488–9.

[59] On this fallacy see Pease on Cic. *De leg.* 2.11, pp. 178–9. First Wil. 1924 i, 114 acknowledged this as a reference to the Megarian sophism, cf. then Ll-J ii, 228, Cameron 1995, 490–1. "Es handelt sich um Sticheleien aus dem Kollegenkreis", K. Döring, *Die Megariker*, Amsterdam 1972, 111. The inference that P. concerned himself with philosophy (Day 14, Boucher 221) is unfounded.

[60] Nicanor's commentary was on P.: in the reliable Ambrosian version (T. 13) it is quoted right after the citation of fr. 15. The Laurentian version of the Σ misled some to consider Nicanor as a commentator of Theoc.: Susemihl i, 225, Herzog 211, Kuchenmüller 29 n. 1 ("omnis commentator Philetae maxime dubius"), A. W. Bulloch, *PCPS* 199 (1973), 84 n. 1, Lightfoot 88. See against them Wil. 1906, 152, *id.* 1924 i, 117 n. 1, Wendel 1920, 74, *id.*, *RE* XVII.1.273, Gow i, xxvii n. 2, G. Damschen, *DNP* VIII.902.

terminus ante quem and his name is common in Cos and in the neighbouring islands in the second half of the 3rd cent. and in the 2nd cent. BC (*LGPN* i, 329–30), which may be the time of his *floruit*. Nicanor's commentary suggests the strong Coan colour of *Demeter* and perhaps a lasting interest in that poem in Cos. After Theon's commentary his own was rendered useless and disappeared.

The interpretation of the references of Propertius and Longus to P. depends on the survival of his work.[61] P.'s inclusion in the elegiac canon, for which Call. may have played a significant part, must have taken place at an early date. The Callimacheans upheld interest in P.: Call.'s 'pupil' Hermippus of Smyrna in Περὶ Ἱππώνακτος quoted fr. 18, as Istrus the Callimachean reviewed *At. Gl.* fr. 46. Antigonus of Carystus in his collection of paradoxes ("*c.* 240 BC, or even later" Wil. 1881, 23) is twice attested to have excerpted P. (frr. 14, 20) and Crates the epigrammatist T. 8 at the end of the 3rd cent. BC refers to him as a classic. In the 2nd cent. BC Apollodorus of Athens had direct access to P.'s work in Alexandria and took account of it in several instances. In his voluminous Περὶ θεῶν he seems to have cited *Demeter* fr. 21 (POxy. 2260.i.1f.) in a discussion of the gloss ἄορ. The citation of *Demeter* fr. 17 among examples of apocope in Strabo 8.5.3 may as well go back to one of Apollod.'s Homeric works. In *FGrH* 244 F 265 Apollod. explained πέλικαν as ποτηρίου εἶδος (~ *At. Gl.* fr. 33) and in *FGrH* 244 F 247 he discussed ἕλινος = ἄμπελος with reference to *At. Gl.* fr. 43. Apollod. may have also referred to P. in his discussion of the chthonic associations of bronze, see p. 276f. Athenaeus draws his Philitan citations mainly on lexicographic compilations of an early date. He preserves fourteen references to the *At. Gl.* and in three instances quotes from P.'s poetic works. In frr. 8, 18 (four words each) he aims at illustrating the glosses contained therein (θρήσασθαι, ὕκης). In fr. 20 he is dependent directly or indirectly on Antig. Car., on whose work he is known to have drawn elsewhere.[62] The insertion of Philitan material in early

---

[61] On the question of survival see von Blumenthal 2170, A. W. Bulloch, *PCPS* 199 (1973), 84, *id.* in Easterling-Knox 545. P.'s name and the Romans: G. Knaack, *Hermes* 23 (1888), 136 n. 1, D. O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry*, Cambridge 1975, 120 n. 2, J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, London 1985, 201 n. 22, Lightfoot 88, all expressing doubts as to whether any Roman poet had read P.'s works first hand. Against them cf. Latacz 1999, 203–5.

[62] See Wil. 1881, 123 n. 1, L. Nyicos, *Athenaeus quo consilio quibusque usus subsidiis Dipnosophistarum libros composuerit*, Basle 1941, 20–1.

lexicographic compendia is at any rate noteworthy. Eustathius (fr. 8, cf. *At. Gl.* frr. 29, 30, 32) depends on Athenaeus' epitome.

A copy of P.'s poems was available in the Alexandrian library until the time of Theon (1st cent. BC).[63] Theon, the chalcenteric commentator of the great Hellenistic poets, is a key-figure as the originator or perpetuator of the scholiastic notes containing verses or references to P. Theon's influence extends not only on the citations and the information contained in the Σ on Theoc. (frr. 6, 27), A.R. (fr. 22) and Call. (fr. 16),[64] but their derivatives as well, i.e. the relative entries in Steph. Byz. (fr. 19 (originally from Apollonian Σ) and fr. 28, both from Orus *Ethnica*), in EtG (fr. 26, perhaps directly drawn on an Apollonian Σ), in Herodian (see ff.) and mainly in the lexicon of Diogenianus (> Hsch., EtM). Here the intermediation of Pamphilus' vast lexicon of 95 books (1st cent. AD) is very possible. Some of Theon's notes were preserved in Salustius' commentary on Call. (the probable source of fr. 16) and in Sophocleius' commentary on A.R. (see fr. 19, cf. fr. 26). Theon may have been the last person to have had direct access to P.'s works.[65] The achievements of his successors fell heavy on the Coan's fate. As A. W. Bulloch, *PCPS* 199 (1973), 84 put it, "it is often the fate of forerunners that they are made obsolete by those whom they enable to supersede". Interest in P.'s poems seems to recede after Nicander. The silence of Philodemus, Plutarch and Lucian, who quote verses from many Hellenistic poets including Antimachus but know nothing of P., is telling. Quint. T. 19 *secundas confessione plurimorum* ranks P. second in the genre of elegy, confessing not to have access to his work but to rely on unspecified earlier opinions. Contrast his wording regarding

---

[63] With *Demeter* and Nicanor's commentary on it, and with the *At. Gl.* (cf. frr. 44, 48 from Apollonian Σ, fr. 43 from Nicandrean Σ, fr. 46 from Theocritean ones) the case seems certain. There is no indication that it was so with *Hermes*. If *Telephus*? fr. 22, transmitted in Apollonian Σ, comes from *Hermes*, Theon could have picked up the piece of information contained therein from Chares.

[64] Theon is not directly attested to have written a commentary on Call.'s *Hymns*, but the marginal Σ on ἄεμμα (*HyAp.* 33) in POxy. 2258.i (fr. 16) could well be a vestige of his activity. On other indications see Bulloch 78 and cf. Pfeiffer ii, xxix.

[65] We can not tell whether a copy of P.'s works was available at Cos after Theon. Theon's dates coincide with the destruction of part of the Library by fire during Caesar's Alexandrine war in 48 BC (Cameron 1995, 191 n. 33 places Theon's activity earlier, *c.* 50–20 BC). The extent of that destruction is unknown, see Fraser i, 334–5, ii 493 n. 224, 494 n. 228, Ll-J, *Greek in a Cold Climate*, London 1991, 115–22.

the evaluation of the Roman elegists in 10.1.93 *mihi videtur* etc. Horace's critical acumen refrained from referring to a poet whom he had not read, despite the fact that in *Epist.* 2.2.99–101 he refers to both Mimnermus and Call. Diomedes I.484.21f. Keil (from Suet. *De poem.*?) names as models of the Roman elegists only Call. (T. 88 Pf.) and Euphorion.

With Parthenius we find ourselves in the realm of an ancient anthology of recondite Hellenistic poetry which contained a number of rarities the traces of which appear in the last books of Stobaeus (Wil. 1924 i, 117). That seems to have contained a representative selection from P.: the passage of Demeter's bewailing from *Demeter* (frr. 9, 10, 12, 13), the Odysseus episode of *Hermes* (frr. 2, 3, 4) and some epigrams and paegnia (frr. 23, 25). It may be that same *florilegium* that contained excerpts from Hermesianax's *Leontion*, to which Parth. had direct access (Hibges, *RE* VIII.1.827), the substantial fragment of Phanocl. *CA* 1 *apud* Stob. 4.20.47 (IV.461 Hense) and the fragments of Alex. Aet. and of the author of Λέσβου κτίσις, which Parth. quotes in *Erot. path.* 14 and 21 respectively. Parth.'s own summary no doubt accelerated the vanishing of the original excerpt.

Henceforth information about P. was preserved in the τεχνικοί, the grammarians interested in the formation and spelling of the words, such as Herodian (fr. 11 from Σ Call. fr. 7.12, and fr. 5 (> Choeroboscus) from Σ Theoc.?), as well as in the exegetical Σ on the *Iliad* (fr. 21, from Apollod. of Athens) and principally in lexicographic entries. At Diogenianus' time quotations from and information about P., from a proficient source, were still available. Hesychius, the heir of his lexicon, shows that Diogenianus draws his Philitan lemmata on commentaries on Theoc. and Call. (Diogenianus' common sources, Latte, *Hesychius* i, xlii, xliv), which probably go back to Theon. So all the poetical entries in Hesychius are perhaps to be ascribed to *Demeter*, the poem that exercised the most influence on Call. and Theoc.[66] Along with the many Hesychian entries pertaining to grammatical fragments of P. there is one that comes from a poetical work of his, θ 405 Θεσσαλαί, perhaps drawn on a Σ on Theoc. 7 (via Eurypylus' mother Mestra?). Three others are trans-

[66] A possibility outside *Demeter* may be the entry μ 699 Μελιγουνίς· οὕτως ἡ Λιπάρα ἐκαλεῖτο νῆσος which is derived from a commentary on Call. *HyArt.* 47–8. An early Scholiast of Call. may not have failed to note Call.'s possible debt to P. (fr. 1a).

mitted anonymously in Hesychius, but from other sources we know that they come from the Coan, fr. 11 ~ α 7862 ἄστλιγγας (from Σ on Call. fr. 7.12), fr. 7 ~ ν 552 νήχυτον (from Σ on A.R. 3.530) and fr. 16 ~ α 1363 ἄεμμα (from Σ on Call. *HyAp.* 33). In the chapter concerned with the influence of *Demeter* it will be argued that entries ε 6569 ἕτερον πόδα (from Σ on Call. *HyAp.* 3), ο 1275 ὀροδεμνιάδες (from Σ on Theoc. 7.138) and υ 243 ὕπαρνος ποίμνη (from Σ on Call. *HyAp.* 53) may as well be quotations from P. Double interpretation of the type 'x or/and y' would appear to be a feature in the exegesis of Philitan terminology, which speaks for some very oblique language. Σ on Nic., on whom Theon also wrote a commentary (Guhl 4–6, Cameron 1995, 192–3), could be another source, cf. *At. Gl.* fr. 43. Of a different derivation (Antig. Car. *Mir.* 8) is Hsch. κ 363 κάκτος, which discusses a paradox from P. fr. 20. The entries ἄστλιγγας in EtM and νήχυτον in EtG (> EtM, Suidas) come from sources depending on Diogenianus as well.[67]

Xb. *Propertius*

Propertius[68] beyond any doubt had access to authoritative information on P. but there is nothing he knows which he could not pick up from Call. or a commentary on him. His assimilation of verse to Coan vests (T. 23a) has been argued to reflect Call.'s praise of *Demeter* (T. 6). In T. 23c.1 *Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae* Prop. addresses Call. and P. and associates P. with *sacra* 'rites', which may allude to the aetia in the establishment of Demeter's cult in Cos, as described in his *Demeter* (Boucher 216–20). Explicit references to P. in a ritualistic context occur also in *ibid.* 3–4 and in Tt. 23e.46, 23f. These testimonies reproduce the semi-religious ambience of *Demeter* as preserved in passages which feature motifs from P. in Call. *Aetia*-prologues, in the conclusion of the *HyAp.* and in Theoc. 7.

---

[67] To Diogenianus' knowledge of Philitan material in the first half of the 2nd cent. AD, contrast the apparent ignorance of Orion Theb. and Methodius in the 5th cent. AD. The last two mention Theon's commentaries and mediate their contents to EtG, in several instances citing verses from Call. and other Hellenistic poets (Pfeiffer ii, xxix–xxx, Guhl 3, 7), but there is no indication that they had access to sources (other than earlier lexica) containing information on P.

[68] P. and Prop. are best discussed in Boucher 205f. See also Butler-Barber xxxixf., Day 14f., Körte-Händel 256, Kambylis 179–83, Bowie 80–6, Knox 74–7.

Prop. T. 23c.2 *in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus* may refer to Call.'s very elegiac Helicon in the original *Aetia*-prologue, where his spirit (*manes*) dwells after his death. Certain features of (and proceedings at) the Callimachean Helicon may be indebted to P.'s *locus* at Bourina, therefore the two poets share the place (*vestrum*). The *Graios . . . choros* in the next verse may allude to the possible orgiastic dancing at Chalcon's palace, which was perhaps alluded to in Call. *HyAp.* 12f.[69] Prop.'s claim in vv. 3–4 that he will first introduce these Greek rites in Rome looks like Philetas' declaration in introducing himself to Daphnis and Chloe in Long. 2.3.2 ἥκω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅσα εἶδον μηνύσων, ὅσα ἤκουσα ἀπαγγελῶν. This feature might go back to a passage in which P. appeared as the hierophant of Demeter (a passage postulated by Müller 1987, 42, cf. *id.* 1990, 28–9) in the Pindaric fashion. Vita Pindari Ambrosiana (I.2.6 Drachmann) says about Pindar's *Hymn to Persephone* (fr. 37 ~ P. fr. 5a) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ ὄναρ ἐπιστᾶσα αὐτῷ ἐμέμψατο, ὅτι μόνην τῶν θεῶν οὐχ ὕμνησεν. ὁ δὲ εἰς αὐτὴν ἐποίησε ποίημα etc., cf. fr. 52f.6 ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν, fr. 150 and see Nünlist 68f. Such a passage could go along with the eulogy of the knowledgeable implied in Call. *HyAp.* 10–1. In *ibid.* 5 Prop. appears to be aware of the fact that the motif of texturing fine fabric in a grotto is Philitan in its origin. In the next verse he juxtaposes two questions of which the first seems to concern an ambiguity in P., the second possibly one in Call. (see p. 229 n. 75). The passage goes on with condemnation of heroic epic, now known to originate in P. (Posid. T. 3) and to have been reproduced in the *Aetia*-prologue. Then the motif of polishing verse with pumice may be one which P. may have used for a bathe of Demeter in Cos, and later (Call. T. 6?) acquired a poetological significance (see p. 290).

In all instances references to P.'s name are coupled with that of Call.[70] T. 23d.52 *Philitea . . . aqua* is the only exception. It means to portray Prop.'s claim for the outmost originality, which he emphatically declares in T. 23c.3 *primus ego ingredior* etc. (for the idea see Kambylis 155f.), but again these same waters are described as *Cyre-*

[69] On the meaning of *orgia* 'rites/cult-objects', a word first occuring in *HHD* 273, see Richardson ad loc., Dodds on Eur. *Bac.* 469–70, Kambylis 42f. On *sacra* see Mynors on Virg. *G.* 2.476.

[70] In Prop. Tt. 23b.31–2, 23f they appear in the chronological order P./Call., which Stat. T. 25 follows too. In Prop. Tt. 23c.1, 23d, 23e.43–4, whence also Ov. Tt. 24a, b, they appear in the inverse order Call./P., which Müller 1990, 29–30 attributed to the "Psychologie der Quellenbenutzung".

naeas . . . aquas in T. 23f.4 and the poem ends with P., as it begins with Call. In T. 23d Prop. comes closer to P. than anywhere else. The sequence of events might reproduce Chalcon's meeting with Demeter, his search for water and Demeter's pinpointing of a narrow path through which Bourina's waters are to flow. Here Prop. seems to employ Philitan motifs going back to the proceedings around Bourina, which were employed by Call. and were mediated to Prop. by a commentary on the Callimachean passages.[71] As in Prop., first comes the appearance of Phoebus (13) then that of the Muses (35), so in Call. appears first Apollo in fr. 1.21f., then the Muses in fr. 2 and in P., it seems, first Demeter then her Nymphs.

Prop. T. 23f.3 *serta Philiteis certet Romana corymbis* seems to know of festive Philitan garlands, which Demeter might have worn during Chalcon's banquet. Demeter early enough bears attributes such as καλλιστέφανος (*HHD* 251, 295) or εὐστέφανος (*HHD* 224, *al.*, Hes. *WD* 300). In Nonn. *D.* 6.44, during a feast held in her honour at Astraeus' palace, the latter's son Eosphoros στεφάνους ἔπλεξεν . . ἄνθεα δήσας/ὀρθρινοῖς κομόωντα δροσιζομένοισι κορύμβοις and in Ov. *F.* 4.616 happy Demeter *imposuitque suae spicea serta comae.* On Demeter's garland seems to depend Lycidas' garland in Theoc. 7.63–4 ἀνήτινον ἢ ῥοδόεντα/ἢ καὶ λευκοΐων στέφανον περὶ κρατὶ φυλάσσων. Then in Long. 2.32.1 the herdsman Philetas is associated with garlands, αὐτοῖς ἐφίσταται ὁ βουκόλος Φιλητᾶς . . . στεφανίσκους τινὰς τῷ Πανὶ κομίζων. The image of weaving various flowers in a wreath was later converted to a poetological symbolism, cf. Prop. 3.1.19 *mollia, Pegasides, date vestro serta poetae* and T. 23d.36 (a Muse in her grotto) *manu texit utraque rosam,* then the *serta* of Silenus, a drunkard, lover of Nymphs and Muses (Clausen 1987, 10–2) in a Theocritean context in Virg. *E.* 6.16. Garlands, symbols of protection and fertility (Arist. fr. 101 in Σ Theoc. 3.21, p. 122.15 Wendel), were commonly worn at banquets and Chalcon perhaps held one to honour Demeter. Σ Soph.

[71] Lawall 103 noted that "since Propertius addresses both Callimachus and Philetas, one may assume that the latter too, spoke of the source of his poetic inspiration in terms of the same symbols". Bowie 82f. from Prop. 3.3 (T. 23d) attributed four motifs to P.: a divine encounter (for him with Apollo), the message "small is beautiful", the *spelunca* in vv. 27f. and the love themes in a rural context. Knox 75 also deemed that Prop. T. 23b.31, c.1–2, d.52, e.43–4 and f.3 are passages "so specific that we may suppose that they reflect specific passages in the poetry of Philetas". Hollis 1996, 57 n. 8 is sceptical.

OC 681 (37.5 de Marco) report that φασὶ τὰς θεὰς ἀνθίνοις μὴ κεχρῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς θεσμοφοριαζούσαις τὴν τῶν ἀνθίνων στεφάνων ἀπειρῆσθαι χρῆσιν, see Deubner 56. The constituents of Demeter's στέμμα were controversial, cf. Σ Soph. *OC l.l. cl.* Istrus *FGrH* 334 F 29. For P.'s interest in the subject cf. fr. 27, *At. Gl.* frr. 40, 42. κόρυμβος, a disputed Homeric hapax (*Il.* 9.241), appears in Prop. as *Philiteis* . . . *corymbis* and then in Nonn. *l.c.* in association with Demeter's garland and it would be a witty metaphor implying fertility, cf. Hsch. κ 3701 κόρυμβον· . . . τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ ὄρους ὕλην, Phot. *Lex.* κ 990 ~ Suid. κ 2124 κόρυμβοι· κλῶνες ἢ ἄκρα. This is a very 'medical' word which is mostly connected with Dionysus' ivy and bears ritualistic associations (Asius *EGF* 13.4, Antim. fr. 100, where the Milan Scholiast notes [κ]ορυμβὶς τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσι ἐπιτιθέμενον, Prop. 2.30.39 *sacros . . . corymbos*).[72]

The difficult *memorem Musis . . Philitan* ('mindful of the Muses') in Prop. T. 23b.31 may go back to a phrase of P. taken up by Call. (Μουσῶν μνήμων *vel sim.*). For such a phrase E. A. Barber, *CR* 46 (1932), 127 adduced Antip. Thess. *GPh* 37.4 μύθων μνήμονας ὑδροπότας, cf. also *GVI* 697.5 (3rd cent. AD) ἀ|νὴρ ἴδρις Μουσῶν, Call. *Fr. inc. sed.* 538 Μουσέων δ' οὐ μάλα φιδὸς ἐγώ and note that Greek φίλος Μούσαις is rendered *Musis amicus* in Hor. *C.* 1.26.1 ~ Virg. *A.* 9.774. P. is associated with the Muses in Posid. T. 3.9–10 ἐκ Πτολε]μαίου δ' ὧδε . . ./ἄγκειτ]αι Μουσέων εἵνεκα Κῷος ἀνήρ.[73] This is a link perhaps facilitated by P.'s possible invocation to Coan/Castalian Nymphs which insinuate the Heliconian Muses. The Muses, as daughters of Mnemosyne, are traditionally associated with poetic 'memory', cf. *Il.* 2.491–2. Moero of Byzantium wrote a poem of diverse mythological content entitled Μνημοσύνη (*CA*, 21). In the *Aetia* the Muses ask their interlocutor to keep their words ἐνὶ μνήμῃ (fr. 7.24 ἐνὶ μ]νήμῃ

---

[72] In the sense 'cluster' cf. [Mosch.] *EB* 4, Nic. fr. 74.22. Medical character: Philonides Med. Περὶ μύρων καὶ στεφάνων *apud* Athen. 15.675d (garland) χλωροῖς πετάλοις καὶ κορύμβοις σκιάζοντα τὸ μέτωπον, 19x in (Ps-)Galen, 26x in Dioscorides Med., 15x in Oribasius. A different interpretation is offered by Hollis 1996, 57 n. 8: "the *corymbi* might come from the θαλεροὺς κισσοῖο κορύμβους with which Meleager (*HE* 1.15) characterises Leonidas of Tarentum (in Philip's introduction to his later collection, the κόρυμβος stands for Crinagoras, *AP* 4.2.7)".

[73] To P.'s relationship with the Muses compare the one postulated for Antimachus by his supporters, Asclep. *HE* 32 of *Lyde* as τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου and Antip. Sid. *HE* 66.3 (Antim.'s verse) Πιερίδων χαλκευτὸν ἐπ' ἄκμοσιν, and, perhaps, Posid. *HE* 24.1–2]Μοῦσαι φίλαι ἐστὶ τὸ γράμμα/. . . τ]ῶν ἐπέων σοφίῃ (Antim. T. 45 Mat.).

κάτθεο, cf. fr. 75.55–6, *Hec.* fr. 83) and Call. may have praised P. for doing this, as Cic. *De orat.* 3.194 praised Antipater of Sidon as *hominis ingeniosi ac memoris*. In Ov. *F.* 3.177–8 Mars retorts to the poet *disce, . . vates operose . . / quod petis, et memori pectore dicta nota*, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.90 and see Bömer on Ov. *F. l.c.* Call. fr. 1.2 (Telchines) οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι corresponds to Theoc. 7.95 (Simichidas of Lycidas) ἀλλ' ὑπάκουσον, ἐπεὶ φίλος ἔπλεο Μοίσαις with which they might have a common antecedent, cf. also Theoc. 7.12 ἐσθλὸν σὺν Μοίσαισι . . εὕρομες ἄνδρα (see Weingarth 105 n. 1). Nowacki 28 remarked that an appeal to the Muses would be suitable in the proem of a catalogue-poem such as *Hermes*.[74]

Prop. of course transforms P. and Call. to love poets to suit his purposes (Tt. 23b, 23e and Calliope's preaching in T. 23d.39f.). A notable exception to this forged picture of P. is T. 23f invoking Call. and P. at the preface of an elegy celebrating Augustus' victory at Actium and the foundation of the temple of Palatine Apollo on that occasion. This poem reworks, to a large extent, motifs from Call. *HyAp.* (cf. esp. 1–12, 31–2, 69–74) and the reference to P. seems to imply that Prop. is aware of the Coan's involvement in that poem. Prop.'s elegy ends with the poet celebrating Apollo's festival with his fellow-poets, as the *HyAp.* ends with the union of Apollo and Demeter, Call. and P. Ovid reproduces Prop.'s distortion about P. *amator* in T. 24a (P. and Call. next to Anacreon) and in T. 24b, both times bracketing P. with Call. Next, Statius, well versed in Hellenistic poetry, lines up P., Call., and Prop., followed by Ovid and Tibullus, which indicates his own sources.

It is in the Roman sources in which P.'s byname *Cous* first appears: Prop. 23e.44,[75] and always so in Ovid. The origins of this appellation are surely Greek, perhaps going back to Call. (T. 7a.9?). Call. T. 6 calls *Demeter* τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κῷον. From a technical point of

---

[74] Butler-Barber ad loc., Boucher 214, Knox 75 and Hollis 1996, 57 n. 8 (the latter calling for caution because of the possibly corrupt text) would consider the phrase as a direct echo from P. Alfonsi 1943, 165 interpreted *memorem* as μνήμων by authority of the Muses, and suggested that as Call. presented the Muses dictating him the *Aetia*, so did P. in order to point out the originality of his verses, but there is no indication to suggest that this was so. G. Luck, *The Latin Love-Elegy*, London 1959, 27 suggested that Prop. "transferred the context of Callimachus, which he had in mind, to the lesser-known poet".

[75] By a plausible emendation of Beroaldus to *Coe* for the codd.'s *dure*, a corruption apparently due to 2.34.44 *dure poeta*. Hunter 1983, 124 n. 20 deems that even with *dure* the reference would be to P.

view this kind of antonomasia is common in Call. (e.g. *HE* 56.3 ὁ Σολεύς of Aratus, see Bulloch on *HyPal.* 18), and it would be facilitated by the Coan colour of *Demeter.* Before Call., one may conjecture that P. would be thus known to a broader circle of erudites in cosmopolitan Alexandria. Posid. T. 3.10 calls him Κῷος ἀνήρ, which might reflect P.'s description in the statue inscription. Compare Archilochus, whose allegiance with his native Paros and its delicious figs is known from fragments such as *IEG* 116 ἔα Πάρον καὶ σῦκα κεῖνα καὶ θαλάσσιον βίον, 166.3 ἱμ]ερτὴ Πάρ[ος, *al.* Therefore, in Posid. *SH* 705.11 τοῦ Παρίου means 'of Archilochus' (see Ll-J ii, 178–9) and Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.23 calls his poems *Parios . . . iambos.* Call. himself was called by later grammarians ὁ Κυρηναῖος (Fraser ii, 1099 n. 521). P. is not known to have had a pseudonym of the type of 'Sicelidas' with which Asclepiades is referred to in Theoc. T. 5.

Xc. *Longus*

P.'s presence in Longus is to be interpreted from the same angle as with Propertius.[76] This time the supplying source is not Callimachus, but Theocritus. After Diogenianus, Longus is the last author to display knowledge of the Philitan origin of motifs and names in Theocritus.[77] Longus associates with his herdsman Φιλητᾶς motifs for which corroborative evidence from other sources suggests Philitan provenance. He appears to be aware particularly of the reworking of Philitan motifs in the meeting scene of Lycidas and Simichidas in Theoc. 7.10f. and in the banquet scene in Theoc. 7.63f. The description of the Nymphs and their cave in 1.4 may be mindful of features first occurring in P. (see p. 265). The sudden appearance and the description of Philetas' outlook in 2.3.1 are modelled on Theoc.'s Lycidas, which may in its turn reproduce features of Philitan Demeter (see p. 227). Philetas describes his walled garden (2.3.3–4) in terms familiar from Theoc. 7 (plants, birds, waters, dry wall), which pos-

---

[76] P. and Longus are discussed from different points of view by Cairns 1979, 25–7, Hunter 1983, 67–83 and Bowie 67f. The question is reviewed by J. R. Morgan in *ANRW* II.34.3, 2249–50.

[77] There is some possibility that Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13 is also aware of the course of action in *Demeter*, as mediated to him through Theoc. and Longus.

sibly originate in Chalcon's garden and the *locus amoenus* in the poetry of his Coan namesake. His encounter with Eros (2.4.1, 3–4) seems to reproduce features of Chalcon's encounter with Demeter. Philetas is brought into connection with Nymphs (2.3.2, 2.17.1), garlands (2.32.1), an ancient syrinx playing like pipes and dancing (2.35–6), as well as with a banquet on *stibades* (4.38.2). As an old oxherd Philetas enjoys high public esteem in Longus. In 2.15.1 he is chosen as the judge of a dispute by common consensus, πρεσβύτατός τε γὰρ ἦν . . . καὶ κλέος εἶχεν . . . δικαιοσύνης περιττῆς. The arbitrator-motif goes back to the Theocritean arbitrators of bucolic contests and might allude to the reputation of Coan judges abroad (see fr. 13). Philetas' speech on the power of Eros is elaborate and ornate, replete with rhetoric figures, and in view of the novel's naiveté, erudite with its reference to Eros' cosmogonic power. Philetas is doubly suitable to play the role of *praeceptor amoris*: first his name suggests that role[78] and then P. was known as a *praeceptor* of Theoc. himself (vita Theoc. T. 14, Choerob. T. 26). The motif of Daphnis and Chloe taking recourse to elder Philetas for advice (2.7, on love) comes up in a similar fashion in Bion fr. 13.7f. and, as Reed ad loc. remarked, "may have been more prominent in bucolic than surviving poems attest". Philetas' family is firmly Theocritean too: his beloved is Amaryllis (2.5.3, 2.7.6) and his youngest son is called Tityrus (2.32.1; we hear nothing of his other children referred to in 2.5.3, 4.38.2). Virgil begins his *Eclogues* with an address to Tityrus and he is the entity to whom Apollo preaches in Virg. *E.* 6.3f. supplanting the poet in the apparent model of that passage, Call. fr. 1.21f. Philetas is also very fond of Daphnis, an originally Sicilian herdsman (Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 83, Stesich. *Spur. PMGF* 279), who in 2.37.3 plays with Philetas' syrinx, which then Philetas enthusiastically hands over to him καὶ εὔχεται καὶ Δάφνιν καταλιπεῖν αὐτὴν

[78] This is pointed out several times in Longus, 2.5.1 ἐμοὶ μέν, ὦ Φιλητᾶ, φιλῆσαί σε πόνος οὐδείς, 2.8.5, 2.37.3 ὁ Φιλητᾶς θαυμάσας φιλεῖ τε ἀναπηδήσας καὶ τὴν σύριγγα χαρίζεται φιλήσας. The same pun might have already occured in Call., cf. *Dieg. Iamb.* 9, fr. 199 (p. 196 Pf.) ἐπὶ κακῷ δὲ . . φιλεῖν τὸν Φιλητάδαν. Longus is attentive to the significance of names, cf. 1.3.2 ὡς δ' ἂν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ παιδίου ποιμενικὸν δοκοίη, Δάφνιν αὐτὸν ἔγνωσαν καλεῖν, 1.6.3 (Chloe), 4.5.2 Εὔδρομον — οὕτω γὰρ ἐκαλεῖτο, ὅτι ἦν αὐτῷ ἔργον τρέχειν, 4.11.2 ὁ δὲ Γνάθων . . . οὐδὲν ἄλλο ὢν ἢ γνάθος καὶ γαστήρ, 4.39.2 (Daphnis and Chloe's children Φιλοποιμήν and Ἀγέλη). For other Theocritean names in Longus see Hunter 1983, 16f., J.-R. Vieillefond, *Longus*, Budé 1987, cxxvii.

ὁμοίῳ διαδόχῳ. All this may suggest that it was P., so much interested in Sicilian things, who brought Daphnis to the limelight (Daphnis appears in love in Hermesian. *CA* 2, 3, Theoc. 7.73f.).

The Longan picture of P. as an old βουκόλος (which is in fact entirely indebted to Theoc.) and Simichidas' reference to him and Asclepiades in Theoc. T. 5 have suggested to some the possibility of bucolic poetry originating in him.[79] There is little confidence in this assumption. P. may well have treated rustic figures in a low environment, as did other poets earlier than Theoc., but there is early evidence that bucolic poetry the way we know it originates in Theoc.[80] "Von Bukolik nichts darin" warned Wil. 1924 i, 117.

Xd. *Virgil*

Virgil was reading Theocritus with a commentary[81] and he appears to be aware of the intricate texture of Theoc. 7. He composed *E.* 6, a poem on poems, in a similar fashion. The poem begins with some very personal statements of the Callimachean type about Virgil's Muse and presents Silenus singing a song comprising many disconnected themes. Silenus, at the end, expressly confesses to have recited someone else's poem, one which he memorised from Apollo himself, 82–4 *omnia, quae Phoebo quondam meditante beatus/audiit Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros,/ille canit, pulsae referunt ad sidera valles.* The reference to Apollo is quite suitable for the parallelism with Theoc. 7, as the

---

[79] Couat 80, Legrand 155–7, Reitzenstein 1893, 260 n. 1, G. Knaack, *RE* III.1.1007, recently Puelma 1960, 150 and the discussions mentioned in n. 76 (esp. Bowie 74f.). Fr. 8 is often adduced as a possible piece of evidence for this hypothesis. T. G. Rosenmeyer, *The Green Cabinet*, Berkeley-L.A. 1969, 40–1 and Gutzwiller 1991, 6 show sensible restraint. See also G. Lohse, *Hermes* 94 (1966), 420, Hutchinson 144 n. 5.

[80] Theoc.'s originality is pointed out in [Theoc.] *AP* 9.434.4 (epigr. [27].4 Gow), which may be as early as the later 3rd cent. BC (Hunter 1999, 1), Μοῦσαν δ' ὀθνείαν οὔτιν' ἐφελκυσάμαν. As Hutchinson 144 n. 5 remarks, Virg. *E.* 6.1–2 *prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu/nostra . . . Thalea* seems to envisage Theoc. as the founder of the genre. For other poets handling rustic themes see Dover lxif., H. Bernsdorff, *Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus*, Stuttgart 2001.

[81] See E. Courtney, *QUCC* n.s. 34 (1990), 103 (*Ecl.* 6.61–3 < Σ Theoc. 3.40–2b), F. Cairns, *HSCP* 99 (1999), 289–93. On the *Aeneid* and the Homeric Σ see R. R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid*, Ann Arbor 1974, further Cameron 1995, 193.

god with his song consoles himself for the loss of a beloved one (*hunc fluvium Hyacinthi causa Apollo dicitur amasse*, Servius ad loc.).

Even closer to Theoc. 7 comes Virgil with *E.* 9. The poet Menalcas, the master of Moeris, has been evicted and his friends have lost him. Young Lycidas meets Moeris on his way to the town and during their walk they recall snatches of Menalcas' poetry. So Menalcan fragments are scattered throughout the poem. *E.* 9 seems to consciously adapt motifs from Theoc. 7 which may originate in P. In this respect the following may be noted: the poem begins with a question recalling Theoc. 7.21, which Demeter may have addressed to Chalcon at their meeting, *Quo te, Moeri, pedes? an quo via ducit, in urbem?*. In 19–20 *quis caneret Nymphas? quis humum florentibus herbis/spargeret aut viridi fontis induceret umbra?* Menalcas appears associated with subjects recalling P.'s *locus*: Nymphs, exuberant flora and a spring under the folliage of a tree. In 40–2 *hic ver purpureum, varios hic flumina circum/fundit humus flores, hic candida populus antro/imminet et lentae texunt umbracula vites*, in an address to Galatea, further features of P.'s *locus* may come up. The appearance of a poplar and a cave, as well as the use of *texunt* ~ Theoc. 7.8 ὕφαινον, are noteworthy. In 27–9 *Vare, tuum nomen, superet modo Mantua nobis, /. . ./ cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cycni* there appears a motif of Pindaric origin which Prop. T. 23c.9–10 associates with P. A couple of lines later, in 30–1 *sic tua Cyrneas fugiant examina taxos,/sic cytiso pastae distendant ubera vaccae* Lycidas, quite tactlessly, wishes Moeris, who has lost his land and is dispossessed, to regain prosperity relying on his bees and the swollen udders of his heifers. The lines may take account of P., where the bareness of land provoked by Demeter is counterbalanced by insistence on alternative means of prosperity such as bees (cf. fr. 14) or flocks (ὕπαρνοι?, cf. Call. *HyAp.* 53 ~ Hsch. υ 243 ὕπαρνος ποίμνη). In 57–8, in a reference hard to account for if the setting of the eclogue is Mantua, the stillness of the sea is pointed out: *et nunc omne tibi stratum silet aequor, et omnes,/aspice, ventosi ceciderunt murmuris aurae.* The motif will be argued to refer specifically to the impact that Demeter's presence had on the winds and the vast sea. It recurs in Theoc. 2.38 and Callimachus employed it with its literary symbolism in *HyAp.* 105f.

On Virgil's attention to Parth. *Erot. path.* 2 (fr. 1) see p. 139f.

XI. *Hellenistic Features and Peripatus*

P. fulfils the typical requirements of a learned Hellenistic poet. He was born in a province under Ptolemaic control, he became closely associated with the Ptolemies and spent some time in Alexandria. Above all, he was both scholar and poet, ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός in Strabo T. 11, cf. Suid. T. 1 γραμματικὸς κριτικός.[82] The expression mirrors in a concise way the amalgamation of scholarship and poetry typified for the first time by P. The juxtaposition of two synonymous terms in Suidas may imply two different descriptions of P., first with the earlier κριτικός, then with the later γραμματικός. κριτικός, a term referring specifically to the *Dichterexegese*, is the title that later Crates of Mallos assumed for himself in opposition to the γραμματικοί, a term associated with Alexandria since Zenodotus.[83]

P. had advocated the principle of learnedness for poetry (fr. 25.3–4)[84] and for his own erudition he had a reputation as an all searching pedant. Hermesian. T. 2.77–8 περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν/ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλιήν first comments on his consuming scholarly toils. Posid. T. 3.5 calls P. τὸν ἀκρομέριμνον, which was imitated by Dionysius Cyz. in a fictitious epigram on Eratosthenes, *HE* 1.3 ἄκρα μεριμνήσας. The characterisation is to be compared with Leon. Tar.'s

[82] Kuchenmüller 36 n. 5 raised the possiblity that this description originates in Demetrius of Scepsis (1st half of the 2nd cent. BC), who was used by Strabo and according to Diog. Laert. 5.84 was πλούσιος καὶ εὐγενὴς ἄνθρωπος καὶ φιλόλογος ἄκρως. Demetrius in Τρωϊκὸς διάκοσμος fr. 68 Gaede attacked Crates of Mallos, who had claimed the title of κριτικός for himself. For such a combination of attributes in Strabo cf. 17.3.22 (Call. T. 16 Pf.) Καλλίμαχος... ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ περὶ γραμματικὴν ἐσπουδακώς, in Suidas cf. ν 374 Νίκανδρος... ἅμα γραμματικός τε καὶ ποιητὴς καὶ ἰατρός. For γραμματικὸς κριτικός cf. Suid. ε 359 Ἑκαταῖος Ἀβδηρίτης· ὃς ἐπεκλήθη καὶ κριτικὸς γραμματικός, οἷον γραμματικὴν ἔχων παρασκευήν, Charisius I.236.18 Keil *inter omnes criticos grammaticos convenit.*

[83] κριτικός in Ps-Plato *Axioch.* 366e means 'professor of literature', cf. then Philod. *Po.* 5.21.16, 5.27.7, Strabo 9.1.10. In Suidas cf. λ 645 Λογγῖνος, ὁ Κάσσιος... πολυμαθὴς καὶ κριτικὸς γενόμενος, ν 477 Νόμος [...] κριτικώτατος τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, further Ael. *NA* 10.42 Τήλεφος ὁ κριτικὸς ἐκ τοῦ Μουσείου τῆς Περγάμου. Galen wrote an Εἰ δύναταί τις εἶναι κριτικὸς καὶ γραμματικός (*De libr. suis* 17) and Pamphilus is said to have written a Τέχνη κριτική (Suid. π 142). On the Alexandrian γραμματικοί (or φιλόλογοι) see Pfeiffer 1968, 159, for the earlier κριτικός A. Gudeman, *RE* XI.2.1912–14, A. Dihle in M. Baumbach, *al.* (edd.), *Mousopolos Stephanos. Festschrift für H. Görgemanns*, Heidelberg 1998, 88–9.

[84] It may be noted that Antip. Sid. *HE* 66.1 in an inversion of Callimachean criticism of Antimachus calls the latter ἀκάματος. A.R. 4.1776 employs κάματος with a literary tinge.

praise of Aratus, *HE* 101.1–2 λεπτῇ/φροντίδι . . ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο, further Lyr. Adesp. *PMG* 987d (comedy?, see Dover on Ar. *Nub.* 101) λεπτῶς μεριμνῶντες. For ἄκρον in a poetological context cf. Call. *HyAp.* 112 ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον, for μέριμνα cf. Hermesianax's τρυόμενον, the anonymous epigram's νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἑσπέριοι and Antig.'s περίεργος. In the anonymous irrisory epigram cited in Athen. T. 21 P. is represented as reporting of his death that λόγων ὁ ψευδόμενός με/ὤλεσε καὶ νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἑσπέριοι. Night is by convention the proper time for φροντίδες[85] and the poetic πόνος involves ἀγρυπνίη, cf. Call. *HE* 56.4 of Aratus (~ Anon. *AP* 9.689). ἑσπέριοι was explained by Ll-J i, 228 as "night-worries that begin as early as the evening of the day before", which may derive support from A.R. 2.42 ἑσπερίην διὰ νύκτα. Then Antig. Car. T. 9, before quoting fr. 19, describes P. as ἱκανῶς . . περίεργος. The brief characterisation of a poet just before the citation of one of his verses is a practice of Antigonus, cf. *Mir.* 24 (Homer) ἱκανῶς . . . περὶ πάντων ἐπιμελὴς καὶ πολυπράγμων and see Wil. 1881, 21–2. περίεργος (originally 'taking needless trouble') applies to persons examining literature in an inquisitive, scholarly manner, cf. Antiphan. *GPh* 9.1–2 γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ῥιζώρυχα μούσης/ἀλλοτρίης, Luc. *Alex.* 4 τό τε περίεργον καὶ εὐμαθὲς . . . εἰς ὑπερβολὴν ἑκασταχοῦ ὑπῆρχεν αὐτῷ.

In P., erudition is combined with fine texturing of poetry. An association of him with *leptotes* is implied in Call. T. 6 (~ Prop. T. 23a?) and in Posid. T. 3. His verses are well worked, cf. the studied symmetry of fr. 25. To this proclaimed principle may allude Posid. T. 3.1–2 τόνδε Φιλίτᾳ χ[αλ]κὸν *[ἴ]σον κατὰ πάνθ'* Ἑκ[α]ταῖος/. . . [ἔπλ]ασεν. Assonance is another characteristic of P.'s verses. Cf. the sequence of sounds of frr. 2.3 *χαλεπῶν ἀχέων*, 10.2 *ὡραίων ἐρχομένων ἐτέων*, the anagrammatisation and pattern of fr. 4.3 νέαι αἰὲν ἀνῖαι or the assonance of φ-λ-ι-ς sounds in fr. 19 *Φλιοῦς* γὰρ *πόλις* ἐστί, Διωνύσου *φίλος* υἱός/*Φλιοῦς* ἦν αὐτὸς δείματο λευκο*λόφος*. Euphonic effects are also produced by juxtaposed words such as fr. 25.4 μύθων παντοίων, internal rhyme such as fr. 25.2 κλήθρην . . μακέλην, or symmetry between the initial and the concluding word of the verse, such as fr. 14 βουγενέας . . . μελίσσας.

[85] Cf. Ael. *VH* 7.7a Πυθέας ἐπέσκωπτεν εἰς Δημοσθένην . . . ὅτι ἐκεῖνος διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς πάσης ἠγρύπνει φροντίζων . . . ἃ ἔμελλεν ἐρεῖν ἐλθὼν εἰς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους and see Davies on Soph. *Trach.* 149.

Indicative of P.'s perception of symmetry is the studied coherence of the word preceding the caesura with the final word of the verse. This applies equally well to hexameters, such as frr. 3.2 τις | . . . ὁδίτης/, 4.1 πολέεσσι | . . . χαλεποῖσι/, and pentameters such as fr. 10.2 ὡραίων | . . . ἐτέων. In fr. 12.1, 2 μελέοιο | . . . κλαυθμοῖο and δειλαίων | . . . πραπίδων the parallel word end occurs at both parts of the elegiac couplet. A. S. Slings[86] rated P.'s pentameters at 14.3% (close to Asclepiades' 14.7%) on the basis of 14 pentameters. My figure is 18.7% (3/16) for pentameters and 33.3% (2/6) for stichic hexameters. The overall figure would be 19.3% (6/31), but it would rise subtantially, if one takes into consideration not only the substantive/attribute — or vice versa — correspondence, but the apparently studied coherence of the word before the caesura and the one at the line end, such as in fr. 6 ἐν προχοῇσι | . . Βυρίνης/, fr. 21.1, 2 Ἀθηναίης | . . . ἄστυ/ and Ἐλευ]σῖνος | . . . λό]φον/, fr. 24.2 ἀνέμων | . . . τέμενος |, fr. 25.1 ἐξ ὀρέων | . . ἀγροιώτης |, fr. 27.2 Διωνύσου | . . ἀπὸ κροτάφων/.

Of P.'s Hellenistic features, attention to aetiology deserves particular mention. The course of action in *Demeter* constitutes a thoughtfully articulated aetium for the goddess' cult in Cos. Fr. 17 alludes to the processions and the use of wool in local cult, fr. 18 to the possible use of fish, fr. 20 to the employment of piping. The creation of Bourina may constitute an aetium for its name (see fr. 6). Fr. 16 seems to be part of an aetiological tale for the name of the Coan deme of Pyxa. The existence of Coan witches in ancient Cos may be accounted for with a reference to their Thessalian pedigree (fr. 15). An explanation for the name of Phlious is provided in fr. 19. Appeals to myth (fr. 26?, fr. 28?) might have also ended with an aetiologic reference. Antimachus displays erudition but lacks this feature in his poetry. Asclep. *SH* 216 ὃ καὶ κυνὸς καλοῦσι δυσμόρου σῆμα appears to be interested in it too.

The Coan's association with Peripatus appears to have been close. Early Alexandria, where Theophrastus was invited to teach (Diog. Laert. 5.37), fostered relations with Peripatus (see K. O. Brink, *CQ*

---

[86] Slings 33–4 with statistical table at p. 37. Slings studied the phenomenon only with regards to pentameters. In Hermesianax (58.3%) and Phanocles (50%) this tendency becomes a mannerism. Call.'s percentages are high enough too (37.1 % for *HyPal.*, 37.9% for *Aet.* i).

40 (1946), 11–2, Pfeiffer 1968, 95f.) and P. worked there as a royal tutor with Strato and might have met Demetrius of Phaleron, two prominent disciples of Theophrastus. His interest in plants (fr. 20), fish (fr. 18), birds (?, see pp. 251, 268f.), winds (fr. 24 and see p. 286f. for Zephyrus), springs (fr. 6) and foundation legends (fr. 19) exude Pepipatetic influence, which can later more distinctively be observed in Call. So do P.'s attention to paradoxography and the natural world. At such an early stage paradoxography is closely linked with science, esp. Aristotle and his disciples. P. is the first Hellenistic poet to integrate samples of this interest of his in his poems. Call. proved himself a champion in this field with his Θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὄντων συναγωγή (frr. 407–11). In many instances Call. professes to have drawn on Aristotle, Theophrastus or Phaenias of Eressus (see Pfeiffer 1968, 134–5, *PGR*, 20). Peripatetic associations appear with P.'s interest in glosses and in proverbs (frr. 2.2, 5). As Aristotle wished, P. avoids an overloaded excess of glosses in his poems, which would result in βαρβαρισμός (*Poet.* 1458a17f.). Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1413a17) held proverbs as felicitous expressions, as they are μεταφοραὶ ἀπ' εἴδους ἐπ' εἶδος. Fr. 20 may hint at riddles exchanged during banquets, which was another Peripatetic interest. So was the attention to ancient names of places, esp. islands (cf. fr. 1a). The tendency for apocope (frr. 5, 17) also complies with Aristotelean doctrine, see fr. 5c. Interpretation of rare Homeric words by appealing to unHomeric evidence in *At. Gl.* is a method first practised by Aristotle and his followers. P.'s metaphorical language in *Demeter* (fr. 9 ἀέξεται . . ./πῆμα ~ fr. 10.4, fr. 13 ἄλγεα πέσσειν ~ fr. 9.1) is in accordance with Aristotle's precepts too, cf. *Poet.* 1457b6, 31, 1459a5 πολὺ δὲ μέγιστον τὸ μεταφορικὸν εἶναι. μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο οὔτε παρ' ἄλλου ἔστι λαβεῖν εὐφυίας τε σημεῖόν ἐστι· τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστιν, *Rhet.* 1405a8 καὶ τὸ σαφὲς καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ τὸ ξενικὸν ἔχει μάλιστα ἡ μεταφορά, *Top.* 140a8f., see D. L. Selden, *ClA* 17 (1998), 303–4. The search for the exactly corresponding term to render the obsolete glosses in question in the *At. Gl.* follows this same principle, *Rhet.* 1405a10 δεῖ δὲ . . . τὰς μεταφορὰς ἁρμοττούσας λέγειν. τοῦτο δ' ἔσται ἐκ τοῦ ἀνάλογον. P.'s rhetorical figures, verbal effects, his anagram in fr. 4.3, the repetition of words or sounds including ψευδεῖς ἀντιθέσεις (*Rhet.* 1410b4, quoting a line from Epicharmus, see fr. 19.1c) are all commended by Aristotle's literary studies, *Rhet.* 1410a24f. Interaction with Peripatus may account for

the call for moderation in mourning in fr. 23.1 κλαῦσαί με τὰ μέτρια. Still, as Call.,[87] P. decisively rejected the long continuous epic poem.

XII. *Athens, Argolid and Southern Italy*

P.'s geographical interests were broad (cf. exotic Arganthon in fr. 26), but he appears to show a particular interest in areas associated with Cos. So Thessaly is mentioned in fr. 15 and a Thessalian town (i.e. myth?) may be treated in fr. 28. His relation with Athens was close. In fr. 23.1 Ἀθηναίης . . ἱερὸν ἄστυ he employs Attic vocabulary to describe the city. Σ Theoc. 7.147a (112.23 Wendel) note that the terms ἔνος and ἄλειφαρ, possibly harking back to P., are Attic vocables. The *At. Gl.* were well-known in Athens (Strato T. 4) and his interaction with Athenian dramatists may have been close. P. was derided as λεπτός on the Attic stage. Attention to Attic Middle comedy is a prominent feature in P.'s treatment of glosses in *At. Gl.* Antiphanes may have known his? ὕκης from P. (see fr. 18a) and Moschion's *TrGF* 97 F 6.10 ὀμπνίου might be indebted to a revived interest in this Attic term stimulated by *At. Gl.* fr. 44. One may as well assume that Euphorion became acquainted with the *At. Gl.* (Crates T. 8) in Athens. Colloquial οὐδ' ὅσον ὅσσον in fr. 4.2 and the possible χαός (Theoc. 7.5) are picked out from Aristophanes. This is in accordance with a 3rd cent. BC tendency: "From the early third century onwards it was not tragedy, but Attic comedy and particularly Aristophanes, that interested the Alexandrian grammarians", Pfeiffer 1968, 224, see also Nesselrath 172–87 on Hellenistic studies on Attic comedy. The construction of a new theatre in Cos at approximately this time evidences Coan interest in drama. There is, however, no cogent reason to postulate a discipleship of P. at Theophr.'s school in Athens (Kuchenmüller 19). Similar assumptions about Call. have long been exploded.

P.'s interest in the Argolid is natural, as Coans were conscious of the fact that they draw their Dorian origins from there, cf. Hdt. 7.99.2 with How — Wells ad loc., Tac. *Ann.* 12.61 and see Sh-W

[87] The term 'Telchines' may be a malignant characterisation with the Peripatetic establishment of Rhodes in mind, of which Praxiphanes was a distinguished member. On the Peripatetic tradition in Rhodes see Wehrli on Eudemus fr. 6, Pfeiffer 1968, 266.

29 (add, perhaps, *Il.* 15.24f. where Zeus abducts Heracles from Cos to Argos), Curty 53. Cf. also the names Ἐπίδαυρος (2x, 3rd and 2nd cent. BC) and Ἐπιδαύριος (2x, 3rd cent. BC) attested only in Cos of all the Aegean islands. Their common cult of Asclepius was a strong bond, cf. Paus. 3.23.6. P. fr. 19 handles the foundation of Phlious, an Argive wedding custom is treated in *At. Gl.* fr. 37 and a Sicyonian gloss in *ibid.* fr. 40. In fr. 14 βουγενής recalls Dionysus' identical Argive cult-title.

Southern Italy attracted P.'s interest too. Cos had ancient ties with Sicily, the Greek cities of which often admitted Coan settlers (one group of them left as late as 337 BC), see Sh-W 80–1 and cf. two 3rd cent. BC inscriptions from the Asclepieum, nos 24a, b Curty with *id.* 50–1, pointing out the mutual bonds of συγγένεια with Camarina and Gela. P. places Odysseus' wanderings around the Tyrrhenian sea (*Hermes* fr. 1.1) and the venue of Jason and Medea's marriage at Cercyra (*Telephus*? fr. 22). Both localisations relate to foundation legends from Southern Italy involving Odysseus and the Argonauts. For these, P. may be indebted to Timaeus' work on the Greek West (active in Athens), whom he may be following in the order of Odysseus' wanderings as well (*Hermes* fr. 3). P. treats a Sicilian paradox in fr. 20, where he mentions a plant confined to Sicily (cactus). In *At. Gl.* he studied glosses from Syracuse (fr. 38) and possibly from Taras or Heraclea (fr. 49) and Sicily (frr. 36, 50). Epicharmus' parents were said to be settlers from Cos (Suid. ε 2766 τινὲς δὲ αὐτὸν Κῷον ἀνέγραψαν, τῶν μετὰ Κάδμου εἰς Σικελίαν μετοικησάντων ~ Hdt. 7.164.1, Diog. Laert. 8.7, see Gow on Theoc. (his) epigr. 18.5), which may account for P.'s attention to his works, cf. fr. 20.2 κάκτος, fr. 36 ἀμόραι. Theoc.'s epigram in Epicharmus' honour (*HE* 17) stresses the fact that he was Dorian and presents him as the inventor of comedy. If P. treated monstrous figures such as Heracles at Pholus (first dealt with by Stesichorus) or Polyphemus (Theoc. 7.149f.), influence by Epicharmus, who had a fondness of such creatures, may have been considerable. Σ Theoc. *Proleg.* F (5.20 Wendel) note of Theoc.'s dialect (κέχρηται Θεόκριτος) μάλιστα δὲ ἀνειμένῃ καὶ χθαμαλῇ Δωρίδι παρὰ τὴν Ἐπιχάρμου καὶ Σώφρονος ~ Anecd. Est. 7 (12.23 Wendel), see further Hunter 1999, 10.

XIII. *Metre*

In the study of fragmentary poets it is customary to issue a warning that the extant material may not be representative and this should emphatically be repeated at the outset. A study of P.'s metrical practices appears to confirm Wil.'s (1924 i, 117) pronouncement that "die Verse sind sehr fein, wenn auch noch nicht ganz kallimacheisch". The breaking of rules which Call. fastidiously observed[88] occurs particularly in instances where P. intends to produce a special effect. The manipulation of metre to this goal is by itself a sign of a proficient poet. So in *Hermes* fr. 4.3 ἀμφὶ δέ τοι νέαι αἰὲν ἀνῖαι τετρήχασιν the correption at the end of the 2nd foot, the spondeiazon preceded by a 4th-foot spondee and the resulting break of Naeke's law are tolerated to produce a verbal effect which constitutes a whimsical intensification of Odysseus' factitious lament. In *Demeter* fr. 9.1 /νῦν δ' αἰεὶ πέσσω etc. the mournful effect is intensified by the first hemistich being covered only by long syllables, a pattern employed to the same effect in fr. 23.1 /ἐκ θυμοῦ κλαῦσαί με τὰ μέτρια etc. and 23.3 /οὐ κλαίω ξείνων σε φιλαίτατε etc. Besides, fr. 25.3 ἀλλ' ἐπέων εἰδὼς κόσμον καὶ πολλὰ μογήσας indulges in the infringement of several rules, but with the unusual spondaic sequence in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th foot[89] it means to rhythmically complement the emphasis on the toils of erudition on the part of the learned poet, which is the message conveyed in that line. If Hsch. ε 6569 ἕτερον πόδα comes from P., it is highly likely that it comes from the centre of a verse with masculine caesura and bucolic diaeresis as its precedent in *Il.* 2.217. The expression would have it parts divided nicely between the two halves of the line, as were Demeter's feet while crossing Chalcon's doorstep. Analogously, if Hsch. υ 243 ὕπαρνος ποίμνη is a quotation from P. the phrase may be divided as ὕπαρνος/ποίμνη (ὕπαρνοι/ in Call. *HyAp.* 53). The enjambement would allude to the pregnant udder of the ewes by placing one word in the small verse 'under' the long one.

---

[88] P. or Call., of course, knew of no 'rules', as we mean them today. It is rather an instinctive refinement of earlier tendencies (P. Maas, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1962, 12 compared Archilochus) that they practise.

[89] In Call. there is only one hexameter with a spondee in both the 3rd and the 4th foot, *HyDem.* 72 οὔτε νιν εἰς ἐράνως οὔτε ξυνδείπνια πέμπον (Hollis 1990, 17), see further Fantuzzi in *id.*-Pretagostini i, 251 with n. 93.

In principle, stichic and elegiac hexameters are to be studied separately. As a general rule elegiac hexameters tend to be stricter in the observance of metrical norms. I give the figures separately, but discuss the phenomena together, as the extant fragments do not show a considerable divergence between the two.

XIIIa. *Dactyls and Spondees*

P.'s favourite patterns for the first four feet of a hexameter are DDDD (frr. 10.3, 13.1, 14, 25.1) and SDDS (frr. 2.3, 4.1, 19.1, 20.1), 4/22 each, i.e. 18.1%, then DSDD (frr. 3.2, 4.2, 21.1), SDDD (frr. 2.2, 12, 24), 3/22 each, i.e. 13.6%. The sequence SSDD also occurs 3x (frr. 9.1, 23.1, 3), always producing a special effect. These accord with Call.'s preference for DSDD, DDDD and SSDD and SDDD (Hollis 1990, 17). The percentages for the contraction of bicipitia are:[90] 1st foot 54.5 (12/22, 3/6 for stichic hexameters + 9/16 for elegiac hexameters), 2nd foot 34.8 (8/23, 3/7 + 5/16), 3rd foot 12 (3/25, 0/8 + 3/17), 4th foot 26.9 (7/26, 3/9 + 4/17), 5th foot 12.5 (3/24, 1/9 + 2/15). There is an unusually high percentage of contraction in the 1st foot which, even if not representative, seems more Homeric (*c.* 40% according to West 1982, 37) than Callimachean (26%). However, it comes close to the figure for 1st foot contraction in Simias' hexameters, 52% (13/25).[91] The high percentage of spondaic 2nd foot and the low of spondaic 3rd foot (all three instances in elegiac hexameters!) tallies with Callimachean predilections. Spondaic 4th foot (26.9%) is high, which is contrary to the Hellenistic tendency "to keep the fourth biceps more often

---

[90] These figures make the assumption that fr. 7 νήχυτον ὕδωρ is clausular. They do not take into consideration fr. 11 ἄστλιγγας, fr. 15 Θεσσαλαί, fr. 26 Ἀργανθώνιον and fr. 28 Ἄχναι. The term of fr. 11 is an *incipit* in A.R. 1.1297; Call. fr. 7.12 places ὀστλίγγων in a pentameter. Fr. 15 could be nicely placed at the runover position of a hexameter or pentameter. Fr. 26 may be part of a construction Ἀργανθώνιον αἶπος, which would suggest its clausular position. Fr. 1a Μελιγουνίδα νῆσον might as well be clausular. In that case the percentage of spondaic 5th foot would drop to 11,5% (3/26).

[91] The figure is that of I. C. Cunningham, *QUCC* n.s. 25 (1977), 96. Aratus' percentage is 38, Apollonius' 30.2 according to Mineur 36. Antimachus with regards to 1st-foot contraction seems again more Homeric than Homer with 45.9% (Matthews 58). Lightfoot 43 gives 31.6% and 28.2% for 1st foot contraction in Call. *HyPal.* and *Aet.* fr. 75 respectively.

uncontracted" (West 1982, 154) and again seems to be a Homeric trait (*c.* 30% according to West *l.c.*, 33.8% in Antimachus according to Matthews 58). Theoc.'s variation is telling in this respect: his percentages of 4th foot contraction rise from 12 in the bucolic poems to 26 in the epic ones (Fantuzzi in *id.*-Pretagostini i, 240 n. 66). The overall percentage for Call. is 19.1 (Mineur 36), for *HyPal.* and *Aet.* fr. 75 only 14.1 and 5.4 (Lightfoot 43), 17 for A.R., 19 for Aratus ("il poeta piu spondaico del III sec.", Fantuzzi *l.l.*), but 28.3 for Rhianus and 40 for the less representative remains of Nicaenetus of Samos (Cunningham). In P. the two long syllables of the contracted 4th foot occur either as part of a longer word or in two different words. Only fr. 4.3 violates Naeke's law.

XIIIb. *Spondaic Fifth Foot*

P.'s tendency for spondeiazontes seems stronger than Call.'s, particularly in the elegiac hexameters. There are three attested spondeiazontes, *Hermes* fr. 4.3 and *Demeter* frr. 12.1, 25.1, i.e. 12.5% of the testable verses. This figure is substantially higher than Homer's 5%, even Call.'s overall 7%, but falls short compared to Aratus and Euphorion's 17% or Antimachus and Eratosthenes' 22%.[92] Of the three attested examples, fr. 4.3 ἀνῖαι τετρήχασιν/ should be examined as a *casus sui generis* due to the effect intended. It allows spondaic 4th foot before the contracted 5th foot (unacceptable to Call. or Euph.) and it has word-break after it. It is divided by a feminine

[92] West 1982, 37 n. 13 noted that Homer's figure would drop to only 2%, if one excludes cases arising from vowel contraction. The rest of the figures are from West 1982, 154. Groningen 262 gives "un peu plus de 15%" for Euphorion, Matthews 58 gives 20.2% for Antimachus, Mineur 36 only 14.4% for Aratus (Kidd 35 gives for the latter 13.8%). Note that Call.'s percentage in *Hecale* rises to 13% (Hollis 1990, 18). In general, Call. allows spondeiazontes less often in his elegiac hexameters. Massimilla 40 knows of thirteen examples in the certain fragments of the *Aetia* (Pfeiffer on fr. 1.31 knew of only ten; 2.7% in fr. 75 according to Lightfoot 43). There is none in *HyPal.* They are also very rare in Hellenistic epigram except in Leonidas of Tarent, see *GPh* i, xliv n. 4. Asclepiades, Posidippus and Theoc. sternly oppose such endings in their elegiac hexameters. There is one exception with a proper name in Asclep. *HE* 9.1 Ἡράκλεια/ and a resonant one in Theoc. *HE* 20.1 ἀνταχεῦσι/ (none in the elegiacs of [Theoc.] 8). Hermesianax feels comfortable with them, *CA* 7.1, 9, 19, 79 (4/49 including *CA* 1, i.e. 8.2%), always preceded by a dactyl. The final word is always tetrasyllabic but in 19 (hexasyllabic).

caesura which is unparalleled in the *Aetia*-hexameters (see Pfeiffer on fr. 303, Hollis 1990, 18–9) but it is common in Call.'s *Hymns* and the *Hecale*. *Demeter* fr. 12.1 κορεσσάμενος κλαυθμοῖο/ presents an unusual line-end with a trisyllabic word, which may again be Homeric in its origin. The proportion of tetrasyllabic : trisyllabic clausulae in the spondaic verses of the *Iliad* is 2.4 : 1 as against 29 : 1 in Apollonius or 10 : 1 in Theocritus. In Callimachean terms, this is an exceptional concluding rhythm and the Hellenistic epigrammatists avoid it.[93] Only fr. 25.1 is preceded by four dactyls (as is normally the case in Call., see Hopkinson 1984, 55, Fantuzzi in *id.*-Pretagostini i, 240–1), fr. 4.3 (DDDS) and fr. 12.1 (SDDD, a common rhythm in Callimachean spondaic verses) are preceded by three.

XIIIc. *Main Caesura and Bucolic Diaeresis*

As with Call., all Philitan hexameters have a caesura at the 3rd foot. The Coan's extant fragments show a balance between feminine and masculine caesura and therefore do not evidence the favour that Hellenistic poets generally show to feminine caesura. Feminine caesura occurs in half of the stichic hexameters (4/8) and slightly more in the elegiac ones (9/17, i.e. 53%), which would become even, if, as I think, Hsch. ε 6569 ἕτερον πόδα is a quotation from P., which would suggest another masculine caesura. The overall figure would be 13/25, i.e. 52% (or 13/26, i.e. 50% with the Hesychian citation). This is comparable with Aratus' 52% (Hollis 1990, 19 n. 27) or with Theoc.'s bucolic and mimic poems with 50 and 52% as opposed to

[93] The figures are from West 1982, 154 n. 48. Such a spondaic line ending occurs in Call. only in *HyJov.* 41 Λυκαονίης ἄρκτοιο/ and in *Inc. sed.* fr. 756 = [*Hec.*] fr. 166 παλαιφαμένης ἀγνοιο/, cf. Nic. *Ther.* 591. However, not all poets abhorred it. Antimachus (e.g. *Thebaid* frr. 22.1, 3, 24.1 ἐποιχόμενοι κήρυκες/, 41a.7 = *SH* 52.7, not in the extant fragments of *Lyde*) and Euphorion (Hollis 1990, 18 n. 22 quotes *CA* 94.2, 130, *SH* 413.10, 13) allowed it. Cf. also Theoc. 13.42 καὶ εἰλιτενὴς ἄγρωστις/, Erat. *CA* 16.11 ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν κρύσταλλος/ ~ *ibid.* 16, later Crinag. *GPh* 13.1. There are no less than 17x of trisyllabic spondaic endings in Aratus (10,7% of the total, cf. Kidd 35), the majority of which (11/17) have a rhythm such as the one in P., cf. e.g. 159 κεδαιομένους ἀνθρώπους/, 1066 ἐπερχόμενον χειμῶνα/. On the epigrammatists see *GPh* i, xliv n. 4. In all these cases the verse is divided by a feminine caesura and the trisyllabic word is preceded by either a single word or a compact metrical unit. Antimachus is an occasional exception to this norm.

his epyllia with 72% (West 1982, 153). All hexameter lines with a masculine caesura have a secondary hephthemimeres caesura or bucolic diaeresis or both. Of the elegiac hexameters with masculine caesura fr. 25.3 ἀλλ' ἐπέων εἰδὼς κόσμον καὶ πολλὰ μογήσας seems inelegant, but the hephthemimeres after masculine caesura without bucolic diaeresis may be pardoned because of the effect intended. Such a rhythm is permitted in stichic hexameters provided that the 3rd biceps is disyllabic, and many Hellenistic elegists do not comply with this Callimachean predilection.[94]

P.'s predilection for the so-called bucolic diaeresis is strong. It occurs in 66.6% of the *Hermes* fragments (6/9)[95] and in 72.2% of the elegiac fragments (13/18), which totals in an overall 70.3% (19/27).[96] A majority of 83.3% (10/12) of the verses with masculine caesura have a bucolic diaeresis as well, as opposed to only 53.8% (7/13) with feminine caesura. The two examples which do not have one (frr. 2.3 and 25.3) both aim at a special effect. This is similar to Call.'s percentage (90%) and to Theoc.'s in the bucolic poems (86% according to West 1982, 154 n. 46). The bucolic diaeresis ending with inverted preposition in fr. 8 /θρήσασθαι πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο and in fr. 10.1 /τῶ οὔ μοι πολέων γαίης ὕπερ (non-inverted preposition in fr. 5 ἀγαθῇ δ' ἐπὶ ἤθεσιν αἰδῶ/) reminds of a regular practice of Call., see Massimilla on *Aet.* (his) fr. 50.46 and cf. Alex. Aet. *CA* 2.2 θεᾶς ὕπο πόμπιμος ἰχθύς/. Hiatus in cases such as fr. 8 is habitual.

---

[94] On Call.'s elegiac verses in this respect see Maas *Kl. Schr.*, 92–3, Massimilla 41. Asclepiades is strict with this rule as well, with only 3 exceptions (*HE* 4.4 (lively dialogue), 26.5, 30.1) in 84 hexameters. Other elegists simply ignore this restriction, such as Hermesian. *CA* 7.13, 31, 61, 85, Alex. Aet. *CA* 3.15, 27, Phanocl. *CA* 1.15, 27, and not least with monosyllabic 3rd-foot biceps, cf. Hermesian. *CA* 7.15, 65, 97 /ὀξὺς Ἀρίστιππος, πάσας δ' ἠνήνατο, Alex. Aet. *CA* 3.13, 4.1, 5, Phanocl. *CA* 2.1 /ἀλλὰ τὸ Μοιράων νῆμ' ἄλλυτον, Posid. *HE* 12.1, 13.5, 23.5.

[95] I. C. Cunningham, *QUCC* n.s. 25 (1977), 97 gives 77.8% (7/9) for the *Hermes* fragments, but fr. 4.3 ἀνῖαι τετρήχασιν/, the inclusion of which would give this figure, may not be a case of bucolic diaeresis. However, spondaic rhythm before the bucolic diaeresis is sometimes employed by Theoc. to produce an effect, see Gow on 1.130.

[96] With the addition of Hsch. ε 6569 the percentage of the elegiac fragments would rise to 77.8% (14/18) and the overall to 71.4% (20/28). Call.'s percentage is 63, 74 for Theoc.'s bucolic poems, only 50 for Aratus. On the other hand, frr. 1a and 26 might come from verses which did not have a bucolic diaeresis. This possibility shows again how relative is the value of figures for fragmentary poets.

XIIId. *Word-end in Other Positions*

The niceties of Callimachean metre are normally observed. Hilberg's law (no word-break after spondaic second foot) is always respected in eight occurences of spondaic second foot. However, fr. 20.1 γηρύσαιτο δὲ νεβρὸς, in a lively exclamation, is an unusual *incipit* in Callimachean terms.[97] There are similar beginnings in Simias *CA* 1.5 /θεσπέσιόν τε παρὰ ῥόον, and in a pentameter *HE* 1.2 /ἠχήεσσαν ἵεις ~ 7.2, in Nicias *HE* 7.1 /εἰνοσίφυλλον ὄρος and in Theoc. 4.52 /τἀτρακτυλλίδες ἐντί (cf. 7.65), as well as in Asclep. *HE* 41.1 /Ἀρχεάνασσαν ἔχω, Theoc. *HE* 1.5 /Ἠετίωνι χάριν and in the *Meropis* *SH* 903A.11 /Ἡρακλεῖος ἄνακτ[ος·], where one could plead the proper names. Such *incipits* often appear to be combined with disregard of Meyer's second law (iambic-shaped words are avoided before the caesura). Fr. 20.1 breaks Giseke's law (words of the shape x – ⏑⏑ do not end in the 2nd foot), which may also be disrespected in fr. 13.1 /ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ, as fr. 10.3 /οὐδ' ἀπὸ Μοῖρα κακῶν may infringe Meyer's first and second laws. However, the last two cases are doubtful and I would agree with Hollis that rhythms of the type /Ἀκταίη τις ἔναιεν do not count as violations of Meyer's first law.[98] It is perfectly possible, though, that P. disrespected this rule, as other elegiac poets of his immediate environment.[99]

Mayer's second law is so often violated that it becomes a mere preference. It is not observed in fr. 10.3.[100] In fr. 20.1 ἀπὸ ψυχὴν

[97] West 1982, 155 n. 51. There are only two such beginnings in Aratus (67, 416 with Kidd ad loc.), both 'Homeric'. In Nic. I find only *Alex.* 145, 560, both with Homeric parallels, cf. Theoc. 11.78, 14.15, 17.88, Posid. T. 3.7. In the pentameter Call. fr. 75.75 /ξυγκραθέντ' αὐταῖς such a 'Homeric' beginning is obviated by elision. There are a fair number of examples in Homer, see E. G. O'Neill, *YCS* 8 (1942), 146, table 21.

[98] Hollis 1990, 19–20. Such dubious cases in Call. were gathered by Pfeiffer on fr. 230 and were supplemented by Massimilla 41. "There is no verse in T. in which the opening word ends with the end of the second foot" noted Gow on [Theoc.] 9.1 /βουκολιάζεο Δάφνι *cll.* verses such as *Il.* 2.436 /ἀμβαλλώμεθα ἔργον, 18.123 /ἀμφοτέρῃσιν χερσί.

[99] Call., Hermesianax and Posidippus are committed to it. Asclepiades (*HE* 2.3, 5.3, 8.3, 18.1 /οἶνος ἔρωτος, 19.3, 41.1), Theoc. in his epigrams (*HE* 1.5, 9.5, 10.3, 21.3, 22.1) and in the other poems (Fantuzzi in *id.*-Pretagostini i, 229) and Simias ("leges quas Meyer detexit Simiae ignotae erant", Fränkel 24) simply ignore Meyer's first restriction.

[100] Call. allowed such rhythms too, e.g. fr. 75.23 Λύγδαμιν οὐ γὰρ ἐμὴ τῆμος etc., provided that the iambic word is preceded by a monosyllable, see *GPh* i, xliv,

ὀλέσασα/ there is word-break after both the 4th and the 5th princeps, which Call. disliked (West 1982, 155), but there are Homeric parallels. Fr. 24.1 constitutes no break of this predilection. Fr. 4.3 breaks Naeke's law (no word-break after spondaic 4th foot), but P.'s commitment to it (if any: many learned poets disregard it) can not be determined, as this verse sacrifices metrical order for the sake of a special effect. The same may be said for fr. 25.3, where the masculine caesura is followed by spondaic word without bucolic diaeresis (Hollis 1990, 20(e)). Note the observance of this preference in fr. 8 /θρήσασθαι πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο and in fr. 10.1.

XIIIe. *Pentameters*

P.'s sixteen surviving pentameters are fine, early Hellenistic ones. There is no instance of iambic shaped word before the diaeresis (in fr. 13.2 πενθέων | the effect is nullified by synizesis). Call. and Hermesianax are committed to this rule, Asclepiades, of course, ignores it (West 1982, 158 n. 68). A prepositive precedes the diaeresis in fr. 10.4 /ἔμπεδ' ἀεὶ καὶ τοῖς and in fr. 23.4 /καλά, κακῶν δ' αὖ σοι, both times preceded by another prepositive or postpositive, both of which virtually have the same 'cohering' effect. This is the norm in Call. (West 1982, 158, Massimilla 42). In fr. 19.2 αὐτὸς | δείματο and fr. 21.2 'Ελευ]σῖνος | θεῖον there occurs lengthening by position at this point, in neither case with movable -ν. This is regular at P.'s times, but it becomes rarer from the end of the 3rd cent. BC onwards (*GPh* i, xli with n. 3, West *l.l.*). As in Call., hiatus is inadmissible at pentameter diaeresis. In fr. 23.2 μεμνῆσθαι τ' οὐκέτ' this is avoided by elision of τ(ε), which is habitual (*GPh* i, xliii n. 3). Of the sixteen known instances only the two pentameters of fr. 23 are accentuated in the last syllable of the verse, i.e. 12.5%.

The first part of the pentameter is often holospondaic. Particularly remarkable is the frequency of spondaic 2nd foot there (14/16, i.e.

Massimilla 43. Violation of Meyer's second law in elegiac hexameters occurs in Asclepiades, who shows absolute disrespect of this rule (*HE* 4.3, 19.3, 25.3, 10, 41.1), cf. also Hermesian. *CA* 7.31, Simias *CA* 1.2, *Meropis SH* 903A.11, Anon. in *All. Poet. Ascr.* 2.1, in pentameters e.g. in Asclep. *HE* 1.2 /ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν, Simias *HE* 1.2, 7.2, always mollified by a preceding monosyllable in Posidippus, *HE* 2 (in both pentameters!), 7.2, 17.2, 22.10.

87.5%!), which may be due to the operation of chance, but at any rate points towards a Hellenistic predilection. As with a similar development in the hexameter, there seems to be a progressive tendency to contract the 2nd foot of the pentameter. This occurs in only 38.5% (15/39) of Mimnermus' pentameters, in 57.7% of Tyrtaeus' (45/78), in 56% of Theognis' first hundred lines (28/50). However, 63.3% (69/109) in Asclepiades, 65.2% (30/46) in Hermesianax, 80.3% in Posidippus (114/142 in *HE*; all five pentameters in T. 3 have a contracted 2nd foot). In Call. *Epigrams* the figure is 70.2% (99/141. Of the 42 instances of unresolved 2nd foot, 17 are with a proper name; excluding these the figure would rise to almost 80%). The more narrative the poem, the lesser the contraction at the 2nd colon: 67.1% (47/70) in *HyPal.*, 50% (19/38) in fr. 75, 50% (8/16) in Phanocles.

XIIIf. *Prosodica*

P. avoids hiatus. Movable -ν (frr. 2.2, 5, 10.3–4, 12.2, 17, 27.2) and elided δ(έ) (frr. 4.2, 5, 6, 9.1–2, 10.3) are regularly employed to serve this purpose. There are four instances of hiatus in the extant fragments. To fr. 5 ἐπὶ [5]ἤθεσιν there are Homeric parallels with digammated words at this position, but cf. also *Od.* *13.114 ἐπὶ ἥμισυ, A.R. *2.660 ἐπὶ ἤματι, Arat. *962 ἐπὶ ὕδατι and see further Campbell on A.R. *3.327 ἐνὶ ἤματι, *id.* in Fantuzzi-Pretagostini i, 209. The hiatus in fr. 8 γραίῃ ὕπο is typical in this position with inverted prepositions.[101] Cf. Call. fr. *43.46 κεφαλῇ ἔπι, *id. SH* *259.29 βρα[χέ]ῃ ἔνι, *Hec.* fr. *9.1 κολουραίῃ ὕπο, *40.5 ἐρημαίῃ ἔνι, A.R. *2.151 γαίῃ ἔνι (with non inverted preposition in *1.443 στυγερῇ ὑπὸ δαίμονος αἴσῃ, *1.1038 αὐτῇ ὑπὸ νυκτί), Euph. *SH* *413.5 λυγρῇ ἐπ[, *CA* 51.5 λασίῃ ὕπο (at masc. caes.). The hiatus in fr. 27.1 τά οἱ, with οἱ after a final short vowel and the old digamma still effective is perhaps the commonest type of hiatus there is (exceptions: *GPh* i, xl n. 4). Fr. 10.1 τῶ οὔ μοι has a solid epic background too, see ad loc.

---

[101] See West 1982, 156 with n. 57. See further M. Campbell in Fantuzzi-Pretagostini i, 206 for A.R., Massimilla on Call. *Aet.* (his) fr. 50.46 for Call., Groningen 263 for Euph.

All cases of elision behave as expected. Following a Callimachean trend, nouns, adjectives and verbs are never elided. 'Innocent' elisions of δ(έ), ῥ(ά) and τ(έ) are frequent, particularly in direct speech. The elision of δ(έ) in fr. 4.2 /θυμέ, γαληναίῃ δ' ἐπιμίσγεαι (cf. fr. 23.2 in a pentameter) does not of course deviate from Call.'s policy of avoiding elision at the masculine caesura (West 1982, 153 with the rare exceptions in n. 44, *GPh* i, xlii).

The so-called epic correption occurs 8x in the extant fragments. In five out of seven instances of correption in hexameters it comes up at the bucolic diaeresis, where it is most common. It usually occurs at the end of a middle verb occupying the 4th colon. It is a verb in four out of five instances of bucolic diaeresis correption, 2x ending in -αι (frr. 4.2, 9.1) and 2x in the less common -ει (frr. 2.1, 10.3). There is one instance (fr. 21.1) in which correption at bucolic diaeresis occurs with an adj. ending in -ου. The only extant correption in a pentameter (fr. 9.2 γίνεται ἡσυχίη/) crops up in the corresponding place. In fr. 4.3 νέαι ³αἰέν the correption at the end of the second foot is atypical of Call. (Mineur 43; with καί in twenty out of twenty two instances in A.R., see M. Campbell, *RPh* 47 (1973), 86), but it is excused due to the poet's intention for an -αι- alliteration. All these instances occur at the final syllable of a dactyl. The correption in fr. 13.1 /ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ, ὃς ἐκ Διός is doubly odd. First, because it comes up in a word ending in -ῃ at the *second* syllable of a dactyl, which is hardly tolerable in a Callimachean elegiac hexameter, see Pfeiffer on fr. 535 for the few exceptions to which Massimilla 43 adds *HE* 8.2. Nor is there an early epic parallel to justify the break in P. In all such instances in Call. the correpted vowel belongs to a monosyllabic word. Secondly, because the correption occurs at the feminine caesura, where it is most unusual (*GPh* i, xl). A correption at this position with -ῳ may come up in narrative such as in *Hec.* fr. 45.1 /ἁρμοῖ που κἀκείνῳ ἐπέτρεχεν (a poem prone to the correption of the second syllable of a dactyl, see Pfeiffer on fr. 284), but Hollis 1990, 23 remarks that such a correption of -η or -ῃ in Call. seems confined to the 1st foot, while in the third syllable of a dactyl it is free to wander. There are, though, several examples in A.R., see M. Campbell, *RPh* 47 (1973), 86 and note 3.170 ἠρέμα ᾗ ἐνὶ χώρῃ ἐπισχερὼ ἑδριόωντες. Despite the ensuing monosyllabic prepositive following the correpted vowel, the coherence of the first hemistich, the sense pause and the punctuation may mollify what Call. would consider an ugly effect.

The treatment of *muta cum liquida* is as expected throughout.[102] In P. I examine the following cases: frr. 2.1 ἐπικρατεῖ, 3.1 ἀτραπόν, 4.3 τετρήχασιν/, 6 μελαμπέτροιο/, 10.4 ἄλλα προσαυξάνεται/, 12.2 ἀπὸ πραπίδων/, 13.1 ἐπὶ χρόνος, 14 μακρά, 20.1 νεβρός, fr. 23.1 *bis* μέτρια καί τι προσηνές/, 27.1 Κύπρις, 27.2 ἀπὸ κροτάφων/ (see ad loc.). P. applies the Hellenistic trend of lengthening a short vowel followed by a word beginning with *m.c.l.*, unless that vowel belongs to a proclitic, in which case it closely coheres with the following word and therefore makes position, as in fr. 13.1 (cf. fr. 10.2 ἐρχομένων) or in fr. 12.2, to which contrast fr. 10.4. His practice can be best glimpsed in fr. 23.1 with both possibilities featuring. Fr. 23.3 ἔγνως/ and fr. 25.1 ἀγροιώτης/ do not break this norm as their scansion relies on early epic precedents. Note also κάκτου in fr. 20.2, where -κτ- makes position, as usual (West 1982, 17). P.'s favourite positions of *m.c.l.* in a hexameter are the 9th (3/10, frr. 4.3, 14, 27.1 — and fr. 25.1) and the 7th (3/10, frr. 2.1, 3.1, 23.1), the latter being Call.'s favourite position too (43% of all cases according to Mineur 43). The inverted combination (*l.c.m.*) always makes position in P. The movable -ν is employed to effect position only in fr. 2.3 ἔκτοσθεν χαλεπῶν.

Synizesis occurs only in a pentameter in direct speech, fr. 13.2 /ἔλλαχε καὶ πενθέων, where it is usual, cf., for instance, Asclep. *HE* 4.2 /ζώνιον ἐξ ἀνθέων, Phanocl. *CA* 1.22 /νῆσον ἔχει, πασέων, Posid. T. 3.10 (~ Call. fr. 2.2, 112.9) /ἄγκειτ]αι Μουσέων and for the epic usage see Chantraine *GH* i, 201. It is not effected in P. fr. 2.3 ἀχέων or in fr. 25.1 ὀρέων. There is no case of a short vowel lengthened when preceded by a single consonant.

[102] In general see West 1982, 16–8. On Call. see Pfeiffer on fr. 544, Hopkinson on *HyDem.* 35. On other 3rd cent. BC poets see Slings 31–2 with a table of statistics in pp. 36–7. On late epigrammatists see *GPh* i, xxxviii–xxxix.

POETICAL FRAGMENTS*

Ἑρμῆς

Fr. 1 (*CA* **5** = **Parth.** ***Erot. path.*** **2, p. 310 Lightfoot)**

Περὶ Πολυμήλης
ἱστορεῖ Φιλίτας Ἑρμῇ

Ὀδυσσεὺς <δὲ> ἀλώμενος περὶ Σικελίαν καὶ τὴν Τυρρηνῶν καὶ τὴν Σικελῶν θάλασσαν ἀφίκετο πρὸς Αἴολον καὶ Μελιγουνίδα νῆσον. ὃς αὐτὸν κατὰ κλέος σοφίας τεθηπὼς ἐν πολλῇ φροντίδι εἶχεν. τά <τε> περὶ Τροίης ἅλωσιν καὶ ὃν τρόπον αὐτοῖς ἐσκεδάσθησαν αἱ νῆες κομιζομένοις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰλίου διεπυνθάνετο, ξενίζων τε αὐτὸν πολὺν χρόνον διῆγεν. (2) τῷ δ' ἄρα καὶ αὐτῷ ἦν ἡ μονὴ ἡδομένῳ· Πολυμήλη γὰρ τῶν Αἰολίδων τις ἐρασθεῖσα αὐτοῦ κρύφα συνῆν. ὡς δὲ τοὺς ἀνέμους ἐγκεκλεισμένους παραλαβὼν ἀπέπλευσεν, ἡ κόρη φωρᾶταί τινα τῶν Τρωϊκῶν λαφύρων ἔχουσα καὶ τούτοις μετὰ πολλῶν δακρύων ἀλινδουμένη. (3) ἔνθα <δὴ> ὁ Αἴολος τὸν μὲν Ὀδυσσέα καίπερ οὐ παρόντα ἐκάκισεν, τὴν δὲ Πολυμήλην ἐν νῷ ἔσχε τείσασθαι. ἔτυχε δὲ αὐτῆς ἠρασμένος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Διώρης, ὃς αὐτὴν παραιτεῖταί τε καὶ πείθει τὸν πατέρα αὐτῷ συνοικίσαι.

3 <δὲ> add. Meineke **4** Αἰόλον ubique P | καὶ P: εἰς Bast **6** <τε> add. Legrand **9** ἡδομένη P: corr. Leopardus **12** καὶ τούτοις P: κἀν τούτοις L. Kayser | αλινδουμένη P: καλινδουμένη Cornarius: ἐναλινδουμένη Bast: ἐπαλινδουμένη Sakolowski **13** <δὴ> add. Hercher

Fr. 1a

Parth. *Erot. path.* 2.1 (fr. 1.1) Ὀδυσσεὺς . . . ἀφίκετο πρὸς Αἴολον καὶ (P: ε ἰ ς Bast) Μ ε λ ι γ ο υ ν ί δ α ν ῆ σ ο ν κτλ.

* Numeration according to the way the fragments occurred in the poems following my reconstruction of them.

Fr. 2 (*CA* 8)

– ⏑⏑̄ ἰσχυρὰ γὰρ ἐπικρατεῖ ἀνδρὸς ἀνάγκη,
ἥ ῥ' οὐδ' ἀθανάτους ὑποδείδιεν οἵ τ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
ἔκτοσθεν χαλεπῶν ἀχέων οἴκους ἐκάμοντο.

Stob. 1.4.4 (περὶ ἀνάγκης κτλ.), I.71 Wachsmuth (codd. SMA) Φιλήτα Ἑρμοῦ· 'ἰσχυρὰ — ἐκάμοντο'.

1 in init. <τλήσομαι> e.g. Meineke 351, <ἄνσχεο> e.g. Scheibner 109

Fr. 3 (*CA* 6)

ἀτραπὸν εἰς Ἀίδαο
ἤνυσα, τὴν οὔπω τις ἐναντίον ἦλθεν ὁδίτης

Stob. 4.51.3 (περὶ θανάτου κτλ.), V.1067 Hense (codd. SA) Φιλήτα Ἑρμοῦ (Ἑρ. om. S)· 'ἀτραπὸν — ὁδίτης'.

1 <καὶ> Magnelli 41 adn. 102 | εἰς Ἀίδαο codd. Par. recc. 1985 et 2130: εἰς ἄδεω SA: εἰς Ἄδεα Tr: (ἀτραπὸν) Ἄιδεω Meineke 350

Fr. 4 (*CA* 7)

ἦ μὲν δὴ πολέεσσι πεφύρησαι χαλεποῖσι,
θυμέ, γαληναίῃ δ' ἐπιμίσγεαι οὐδ' ὅσον ὅσσον,
ἀμφὶ δέ τοι νέαι αἰὲν ἀνῖαι τετρήχασιν

Stob. 4.40.12 (περὶ κακοδαιμονίας), V.922 Hense (cod. S) τοῦ αὐτοῦ (sc. Philitae)· 'ἦ μὲν δὴ — τετρήχασιν'.

1 πολέεσσι S: πελάγεσσι Wil. 1884, 191 adn. 33 | χαλεπῆσι S: corr. Tr

Fr. 5 (*CA* 9)

– ⏑⏑̄ – ⏑⏑̄ – ἀγαθὴ δ' ἐπὶ ἤθεσιν αἰδώ

a¹. Choerob. ad Theod. 360.16, I.333.10 Hilgard ἰστέον ὅτι τὸ αἰδὼς Φιλίτας (: Φιλίππας plurr., v. T. 26) ὁ διδάσκαλος Θεοκρίτου χωρὶς τοῦ ς προηνέγκατο εἰπών· 'ἀγαθή — αἰδώ'. **a².** Phot. *Lex.* α 552, I.64 Theod. αἰδώ· χωρὶς τοῦ ς. 'ἀγαθὴ — αἰδώ'. ἡ λέξις Ἡρωδιανοῦ (II.763.20 Lentz).

δὲ ἐπὶ codd. ambo locis | ἐπὶ codd.: ἔπι Bergk

Δημήτηρ

Fr. 5a

Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.9–10 (T. 7a) ἀλλὰ καθέλκει/. . πο.λ.ὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄ μ π ν ι α Θ ε σ μ ο φ ό ρ ο̣ [ς κτλ. | Cf. Σ Flor. ad loc. (T. 7b) παρα]τίθετα̣ί̣ τε ἐν σ(υγ)κρίσει τὰ ὀλίγων στί|χ(ων) ὄν]τ̣(α) ποιήματα Μιμνέρμου τοῦ Κο|λοφω]νίου καὶ Φιλ{ε}ίτα τοῦ Κῴου βελτ{ε}ίονα| τ(ῶν) πολ]υστίχων αὐτ(ῶν) φάσκων εἶναι [. . . . |.

Fr. 6 (*CA* 24)

νάσσατο δ' ἐν προχοῇσι μελαμπέτροιο Βυρίνης

Σ KGLEAT Theoc. 7.6, 79.20 Wendel Βούριναν: κρήνην λέγει τῆς Κῶ. Φιλητᾶς· 'δάσαντο — Βουρρίνης'. Νικάνωρ δὲ ὁ Κῷος ὑπομνηματίζων (T. 13) φησί· 'Βούρινα πηγὴ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἐστίν, ἧς τὸ πρόσωπον βοὸς ῥινὶ παραπλήσιον'.

δάσαντο codd.: νάσσατο Heinse, *Schol. Theoc.* 1604, 336: δάσσατο Kayser | σελαμπέτροιο codd.: μελαμπέτροιο Heinse: -τροις Nowacki: -τρου Hartung | hex. finem interiisse proposuit Ahrens | Βουρρίνης GLEAT (Βουρίννης K): Βυρίνης Bach: Βορίνης Heinse

Fr. 7 (*CA* 21)

νήχυτον ὕδωρ

a[1, 2]. EtM 602.40 Gaisf. (EtG (AB) ν 74 ap. Curiazi, *MCr* 15–7 (1980–82), 251) νη· στερητικόν ἐστιν ἐπίρρημα· ὁρᾶται δὲ καὶ ἐπιτατικόν, ὡς ἐν τῷ νηλής, νήνεμος, 'νήχυτον ὕδωρ' Φιλήτας· καὶ 'μαράθου δὲ νήχυτος ὅρπηξ' (Nic. *Ther.* 33). **a**[3]. ex Etym. Suid. ν 295, III.460.1 Adler νῆ· στερητικὸν ἐπίρρημα. ἔστι καὶ ἐπιτατικόν. ὅθεν 'νήχυτον ὕδωρ' καὶ 'νήχυτος ὅρπηξ'. **b.** Hsch. ν 552, II.713 Latte νήχυτον (Mususus: -χιτον H)· πολύ.

Fr. 8 (*CA* 14)

θρήσασθαι πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο – ⏑⏑ – x

a[1]. Athen. 5.192e, I.428 Kaibel ὁ γὰρ θρόνος αὐτὸ μόνον ἐλευθέριός ἐστιν καθέδρα σὺν ὑποποδίῳ, ὅπερ θρῆνυν καλοῦντες ἐντεῦθεν αὐτὸν ὠνόμασαν θρόνον τοῦ θρήσασθαι χάριν, ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ καθέζεσθαι τάσσουσιν, ὡς Φιλίτας (A: Φιλήτας CE)· 'θρήσασθαι — ὕπο'. **a**[2]. de

quo Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1482.4 θρόνος δὲ ὅτι ἐλευθέριός ἐστιν καθέδρα σὺν ὑποποδίῳ καὶ ὅτι θρῆνυν τὸ ὑποπόδιον καλοῦντες ἐντεῦθεν καὶ τὸν θρόνον ὠνόμασαν τοῦ θρήσασθαι χάριν, ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ καθέζεσθαι λέγουσιν, ὁ Ἀθήναιος λέγει. παρ' ᾧ καὶ χρῆσις Φιλήτα, τό 'θρήσασθαι — ὑπο'.

θρήσασθαι δὲ ACE: δὲ del. Musurus: θρῆσσαι δὲ Maas pace Kuchenmüller 81 | γαίῃ ACE: corr. O. Schneider, *Philol.* 6 (1851), 523 adn. 18

Fr. 9 (*CA* 1)

νῦν δ' αἰεὶ πέσσω, τὸ δ' ἀέξεται ἄλλο νεῶρες
  πῆμα, κακοῦ δ' οὔπω γίνεται ἡσυχίη

Stob. 4.40.11 (περὶ κακοδαιμονίας), V.922 Hense (codd. SMA) Φιλήτα Δήμητρος (Δήμ. om. S)· 'νῦν δ' — ἡσυχίη'.

Fr. 10 (*CA* 3)

τῶ οὔ μοι πολέων γαίης ὕπερ ἠδὲ θαλάσσης
  ἐκ Διὸς ὡραίων ἐρχομένων ἐτέων
. . . .
οὐδ' ἀπὸ Μοῖρα κακῶν μελέῳ φέρει, ἀλλὰ μένουσιν
  ἔμπεδ' ἀεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλα προσαυξάνεται

Stob. 4.40.15 (περὶ κακοδαιμονίας), V.923 Hense (cod. S) Φιλήτα· 'τῶ οὔ μοι — προσαυξάνεται'.

1 τῶ οὔ μοι S: cruces adp. Powell, "emendatio incerta" Hense, alii alia | πολέων S: πλεῖον Emperius, *RhM* 1 (1842), 457 | οὐδέ S: corr. Gesner[2] **2** ἔσχομεν ὧν S: corr. Jacobs | inter vv. 2 et 3 lacunam extitisse suspicatus sum **3** μελέω κακῶν S: κακῶν μελέῳ Passow: κακῶν μελεδῶ von Blumenthal 2168: μελέῳ τι κακῶν Heinrich | φέρουσιν S: corr. Grotius, *Dict. poet.* 1623, 554 **4** ἔμπεδα καὶ S: ἔμπεδ' ἀ<εὶ> καὶ Meineke, *Stob. Flor.* iv 1857, vii

Fr. 11 (*SH* 675B)

ἄστλιγγας

a. Σ A.R. 1.1297, 117.13 Wendel ὄστλιγγες: αἱ λαμπηδόνες. ἐν ἄλλοις (codd.: ἐν Αἰτίοις Wendel, vix recte) δὲ σημαίνει ἡ λέξις τοὺς βόστρυχας· 'ἀπ' ὀστλίγγων δ' αἰὲν ἄλειφα ῥέει' (Call. *Aet.* fr. 7.12). τοῦτο δέ φησιν Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τῷ β' τῆς Καθόλου (I.44.4 Lentz)· 'παρὰ μὲν Ἀπολλωνίῳ (*Arg.* 1.1297?) καὶ Φιλητᾷ διὰ τοῦ ᾱ'. **b.** Hsch. α 7862, I.266 Latte ἄστλιγγας (M. Schmidt: ἄστιγνας H)· αὐγάς (EtM l.s.: αἴγας H)· ἢ ἄστριγγας. **c.** EtM (POR) α 1979, II.265.17 L.-L. ἄστλιγγας (Gaisford:

ἀττίαγγας codd.)· τὰς ὑποφυλλίδας τῶν βοτρύων· οἱ δὲ ἀκτῖνος αὐγάς. ἔνιοι ἄστριγγας (OR: -ὔγγας P), καὶ ἄστριγας (R: -υγγας P: -ηγγας O) ἄλλοι.

acc. plur. ex Hsch., EtM ll.cc. scripsi

Fr. 12 (*CA* 2.3–4)

καὶ γάρ τις μελέοιο κορεσσάμενος κλαυθμοῖο
κήδεα δειλαίων εἷλεν ἀπὸ πραπίδων

Stob. 4.56.26a (παρηγορικά), V.1129 Hense (codd. SMA) Φιλήτα Δήμητρος (τ(οῦ) αὐτ(οῦ) S)· 'καὶ γάρ τις — ἀπὸ πραπίδων'.

1 κορεσσόμενος SMA: corr. Frob.

Fr. 13 (*CA* 2.1–2)

ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ, ὃς ἐκ Διὸς ἄλγεα πέσσειν
ἔλλαχε καὶ πενθέων φάρμακα μοῦνος ἔχει

Stob. 4.56.26 (παρηγορικά), V.1129 Hense (codd. SMA) Φιλήτα Δήμητρος (Δήμ. om. S)· 'ἀλλ' ὅτ' — ἔχει'.

Fr. 14 (*CA* 22)

βουγενέας φθάμενος προσεβήσαο μακρὰ μελίσσας

Antig. Car. *Mir.* 19, *PGR* 40.121 ἴδια δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰς συγκρίσεις καὶ ἀλλοιώσεις τῶν ζῴων, ἔτι δὲ γενέσεις, οἷον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τὸν βοῦν ἐὰν κατορύξῃς ἐν τόποις τισίν, ὥστε αὐτὰ τὰ κέρατα τῆς γῆς ὑπερέχειν, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἀποπρίσῃς, λέγουσιν μελίττας ἐκπέτεσθαι· σαπέντα γὰρ αὐτὸν εἰς τοῦτο διαλύεσθαι τὸ ζῷον. (2) ᾧ καὶ φαίνεται Φιλίτας προσέχειν, ἱκανῶς ὢν περίεργος· προσαγορεύει οὖν αὐτὰς βουγενεῖς λέγων· 'βουγενέας — μελίσσας'.

φάμενος P: φθάμενος J. Barnes ap. Warton, *Vit. Theoc.* 1770, li | προσεβήσαο P: προσεβήσατο Bach: προσεβώσατο pessime Hartung

Fr. 15 (*SH* 675C)

Θεσσαλαί

Hsch. θ 405, II.317 Latte Θεσσαλαί· αἱ Κῷαι παρὰ Φιλήτᾳ καὶ αἱ φαρμακίδες.

θεσπαλαι H: corr. Salmasius

Fr. 16 (*SH* 673)

αὐτὰρ ὅ γε ⏑⏑– γυμνὸν ἄεμμα ⏑–

a. Σ marg. ad Call. *HyAp.* 33 ap. POxy. 2258A fr. 2 verso, pap. saec. p.C. VI/VII, ed. E. Lobel (1952) <ἄεμμα:> τ[ὸ] τόξον κ(αὶ) Φιλί|[τας ἐν] Δήμητρι· 'αυτα ẹγε|].[.].. γυμνὸν ἄεμμα|].' (suppl. Lobel). **b.** Hsch. α 1363, I.49 Latte ἄεμμα· τόξον . . .

"post αυτα spatium vacuum (littera una angustiore non amplius), deinde ẹ dispexit Lobel neque intellexit; nos dubitantissime, ut in atramento evanido, de αυτα.ογε cogitamus, ut sit αὐτὰρ ὅ γ(ε)" *SH* ad loc. | αὐτὰρ ὅγε/e.g. <εἵλκυσε> γυμνὸν ἄεμμα temptavit *A. S. Hollis

Fr. 17 (*CA* 19)

δμωΐδες εἰς ταλάρους λευκὸν ἄγουσιν ἔρι

Strabo 8.5.3, V.136 Baladié + Aly 7.ii.4 (inter exempla apocopes) Εὐφορίων δὲ καὶ τὸν ἧλον λέγει ἧλ (*CA* 153a)· παρὰ Φιλίτᾳ (Φιλε·ται Π: Φιλήτᾳ codd.) δέ· 'δμωΐδες — ἔρι' (<τὸ ἔριον> Coraes). 'εἰς ἄνεμον δὲ τὰ πηδά' τὰ πηδάλια Ἄρατος (fr. 155 Maass). Δωδῶ δὲ τὴν Δωδώνην Σιμμίας (*CA* 10).

Fr. 18 (*CA* 20)

οὐδ' ὕκης ἰχθὺς ἔσχατος ἐξέφυγεν

Athen. 7.327b–c, II.220 Kaibel Ζηνόδοτος δέ φησι Κυρηναίους τὸν ὕκην ἐρυθρῖνον καλεῖν. Ἕρμιππος δὲ ὁ Σμυρναῖος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἱππώνακτος (*FGrH* 1026 F 55) ὕκην ἀκούει τὴν ἰουλίδα· εἶναι δ' αὐτὴν δυσθήρατον. διὸ καὶ Φιλίταν (A: Φιλητάν CE) φάναι· 'οὐδ' ὕκη — ἐξέφυγεν'.

ὕκη ACE: corr. Dindorf

Fr. 19 (*CA* 4)

Φλιοῦς γὰρ πόλις ἐστί, Διωνύσου φίλος υἱός
Φλιοῦς ἥν αὐτὸς δείματο λευκολόφος

Steph. Byz. 667.20 Mein. Φλιοῦς· πόλις Πελοποννήσου, ἡ πρότερον Ἀραιθυρέα καὶ Ἀράντεια, ἀπὸ Φλιοῦντος τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ Χθονοφύλης. Παυσανίας δὲ (2.12.6) ἀπὸ Φλίαντος, ὡς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὸ ἐθνικὸν Φλιούντιος ἢ Φλιούσιος (ὡς μαρτυρεῖ . . . Φλιούσιος post Χθονοφύλης

transp. Meineke: eiecit Nowacki). Φιλήτας δέ φησι· 'Φλιοῦς — λευκολόφος'. ὠνόμασται δὲ παρὰ τὸ φλεῖν, ὅ ἐστιν εὐκαρπεῖν.

1 γὰρ RV: om. cett. | τοῦ Διονύσου codd.: corr. Salmasius

Fr. 20 (*CA* 16)

γηρύσαιτο δὲ νεβρὸς ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ὀλέσασα
ὀξείης κάκτου τύμμα φυλαξαμένη

a[1]. Antig. Car. *Mir.* 8, *PGR* 34.40 οὐχ ἧττον δὲ τούτου θαυμαστόν, καθωμιλημένον δὲ μᾶλλον τὸ περὶ τὴν ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἄκανθον τὴν καλουμένην κάκτον· εἰς ἣν ὅταν ἔλαφος ἐμβῇ καὶ τραυματισθῇ, τὰ ὀστᾶ ἄφωνα καὶ ἄχρηστα πρὸς αὐλοὺς ἴσχει. ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Φιλίτας ἐξηγήσατο περὶ αὐτῆς εἴπας· 'γηρύσαιτο — φυλαξαμένη'. **a[2].** hinc Athen. 2.71a, I.167 Kaibel (de cacto agens) καὶ Φιλίτας (Φιλητᾶς CE) ὁ Κῷος· 'γηρύσαιτο — φυλαξαμένη'. | de Antig. Hsch. κ 363, II.397 Latte κάκτος· ἄκανθα, ὑφ' ἧς ἐὰν πληγῇ νεβρὸς, ἀχρεῖα ἴσχει τὰ ὀστᾶ εἰς αὐλούς. | hic spectat Σ Theoc. 4.57b, 151.6 Wendel ἀσπάλαθοι: εἶδος ἀκάνθης, ᾗ πληγέντες οἱ ἔλαφοι ἀποθνήσκουσιν.

1 νεβρὸς Antig. P: νεκρὸς Athen. CE | ψυχὴν Athen. CE: ζωὴν Antig. P | ὀλέσασα Antig. P: ὤλεσσα Athen. E: ὤλεσα Athen. C

Fr. 21 (*SH* 674)

⌊καί κεν Ἀθηναίης δολιχαόρου⌋ ἱερὸν ἄστυ
καί κε[ν Ἐλευ]σῖνος θεῖον ἴδοι[μι λό]φον

a[1]. Σ T (ex.) *Il.* 21.179b, V.163 Erbse ἄορι: τῷ δόρατι. Φιλήτας· 'καί κεν Ἀθηναίης δολιχαόρου' ἀντὶ τοῦ μέγα δόρυ ἐχούσης. **a[2].** Σ T (ex.) *Il.* 14.385, III.656 Erbse {δεινὸν} ἄορ: τινὲς τὴν τρίαιναν, ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἀρκάδες καὶ Αἰτωλοὶ πᾶν ὅπλον ἄορ καλοῦσιν· ὅθεν καὶ ''Ἀπόλλωνος χρυσαόρου' (*Il.* 5.509) καὶ ''Ἀθηναίης δολιχαόρου ἱερὸν ἄστυ'. ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς μόνον τὸ ξίφος, παρὰ τὸ αἰωρεῖσθαι. **b.** POxy. 2260.i.1, pap. saec. p.C. II, ed. E. Lobel (1952) 'ἱερὸν ἄστυ καί κε[ν Ἐλευ]|σ{ε}ῖνος θεῖον ἴδοι[.. λό]|φον'· (*vac.*) καὶ ὁ τὴν Φορ[ωνίδα]| πεποιηκώς, ἐν ο[ἷς φη]|σιν· 'οὐδ' ἔτι κουρ[-/ἀρκέσει ἐγρεμάχη [δο]|λιχάορος ἀγρομε[ν- (*EGF* 5).| οὔτε γὰρ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶ[ν ξι]|φηφο-ροῦσαν εἰσάγ[ου]|σιν οὔθ' οἱ τοῖς πο[ιητι]|κοῖς ὀνόμασι κατὰ τ[ρό]|πον χρώμενο[ι] τὸ [ἄορ]| ἀντὶ τοῦ δόρ[ατο]ς [τ]άτ|τ[ο]υσι<ν> ὥστε τὴν ọị[ο]ν|εἰ δολιχεγχῆ δολιχά|ορον λέγεσθαι. ἀλλὰ| τὸ μὲν ξίφος ἄορ

[ε]ὐλ[ό]|γως· [. . .] τὸ δ[ὲ ἄορ]| οὐ πάντως ἔγχος ἐσ[τίν,]| ἐν χειρὶ τὴν χρείαν π[α]|ρεχόμενον καὶ φο|ρούμενον ὥσπερ ἐγ|χειρίδιον. οὗτοι μὲν ο[ὖν]| καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλο[ῖς]| τὴν τοιαύτην τῶν ὀν[ομάτων (<μετάθεσιν> Merkelbach, *APF* 16 (1956), 115).

2 ἴδοι[μι e.g. Lobel, sane certum: ἴδοι[τε Snell ap. *SH l.l.*

Τήλεφος?

Fr. 22 (*CA* **15**)

Σ A.R. 4.1141, 307.17 Wendel ἔνθα τότ' ἐστόρε<σαν>: ἐν τῷ ἄντρῳ <τῷ> Μάκριδός φησι τὸν γάμον γεγενῆσθαι Μηδείας καὶ Ἰάσονος, Φιλητᾶς δὲ ἐν Τηλέφῳ ἐν τῇ Ἀλκινόου οἰκίᾳ.

2 <τῷ> ins. H. Fraenkel ap. Wendel *l.l.* **3** ἐν Τηλέφῳ codd.: ὁ Τηλέφου Bach, fort. recte

Ἐπιγράμματα and Παίγνια

Fr. 23 (*CA* **11 + 12**)

Ἐκ θυμοῦ κλαῦσαί με τὰ μέτρια καί τι προσηνές
εἰπεῖν, μεμνῆσθαι τ' οὐκέτ' ἐόντος ὁμῶς.
— Οὐ κλαίω ξείνων σε φιλαίτατε, πολλὰ γὰρ ἔγνως
καλά, κακῶν δ' αὖ σοι μοῖραν ἔνειμε θεός.

a. Stob. 4.56.10 (παρηγορικά), V.1125 Hense (codd. SMA) Φιλήτα Παιγνίων (Παιγ. om. S)· ''Ἐκ θυμοῦ — ὁμῶς'.
b. Stob. 4.56.11 (παρηγορικά), V.1125 Hense (codd. SMA) Φιλήτα (Brunck: Φιλέα SMA) Ἐπιγραμμάτων (Ἐπιγρ. om. S)· 'Οὐ κλαίω — θεός'.
Duo disticha conjunxit Schneidewin.

1 μέγα SMA: μάλα Brunck: corr. Jacobs **2** ὁμῶς SMA: ὅμως Bergk **4** νέμει SMA: corr. Gesner[1]

Fr. 24 (*CA* **13**)

γαῖαν μὲν φανέουσι θεοί ποτε· νῦν δὲ πάρεστιν
αἰψηρῶν ἀνέμων μοῦνον ὁρᾶν τέμενος

Stob. 4.17.15 (περὶ ναυτιλίας καὶ ναυαγίου), IV.401 Hense (codd. SMA) Φιλήτα Ἐπιγραμμάτων· 'γαῖαν — τέμενος'.

2 αἰψηρῶν S: αἰψηλῶν M: λαιψηρὸν A | τέμενος SMA: τὸ μένος frustra Valckenaer, *Diatr. Eurip.* 1767, 239

Fr. 25 (*CA* 10)

Οὔ μέ τις ἐξ ὀρέων ἀποφώλιος ἀγροιώτης
  αἱρήσει κλήθρην αἱρόμενος μακέλην,
ἀλλ' ἐπέων εἰδὼς κόσμον καὶ πολλὰ μογήσας
  μύθων παντοίων οἶμον ἐπιστάμενος.

Stob. 2.4.5 (περὶ λόγου καὶ γραμμάτων), II.27 Wachsmuth (codd. ASTr) Φιλήτα Παιγνίων (Φιλήτα A, Φιλητ παιγν~ S, Φιλήτου παιγνία Tr)· 'Οὔ μέ τις — ἐπιστάμενος'.

Fragmenta incertae sedis

Fr. 26 (*SH* 675A)

Ἀργανθώνιον

EtG (AB) α 1131, II.176.6 L.-L. (EtM (PSORMV^{b}) α 1726, II.169.26 L.-L.) Ἀργανθώνειον· ὄρος Κίου (A: Κείου B), οἷον 'ἀμφ' Ἀργανθώνειον ὄρος προχοάς τε Κίοιο' (A.R. 1.1178)· τινὲς δὲ Ἀργανθώνην αὐτό φασιν (προχοὰς... φασιν om. B). Εὐφορίων δὲ (*CA* 75) καὶ Φιλίτας (Φιλίας AB, EtM: Φιλήτας EtSym. (EtM) V^{b} suprascr. γρ. Φιλίας) Ἀργανθώνιον λέγουσι διὰ τοῦ ῑ, οἷον 'χθιζόν μοι κνώσσοντι παρ' Ἀργανθώνιον αἶπος'. (hic desinit B.) {καὶ λέγουσι διὰ τοῦ ῑ.} Σιμύλος δὲ (*SH* 725) ποταμόν φησιν (EtM R: φα(σιν) A), οἷον 'Μύσιον ἀπύοντα παρὰ ῥόον Ἀργανθώνης'.

Fr. 27 (*CA* 18)

τά οἵ ποτε Κύπρις ἑλοῦσα
μῆλα Διωνύσου δῶκεν ἀπὸ κροτάφων

Σ KUEA Theoc. 2.120b, 290.1 Wendel μᾶλα μὲν ἐν κόλποισι <Διωνύσοιο>: τὰ ἐράσμια καὶ ἔρωτος ποιητικά, καθὸ <τὰ> (add. Ahrens) ὑπὸ Ἀφροδίτης διδόμενα τῷ Ἱππομένει μῆλα ἐκ τῶν (Wendel: τοῦ codd.) Διονύσου, ταῦτα δὲ εἰς ἔρωτα τὴν Ἀταλάντην ἐκίνησεν, ὥς φησιν ὁ

Φιλητᾶς (UEA (corr. in Φιλιτᾶς UE): Φιλήτας K)· 'τά οἵ ποτε — κροτάφων'.

1 ἐλοῦσα K: ἐλοῖσα cett. **2** Διωνύσοιο K: Διόνυσον cett.: corr. Casaubon ap. Heinse, *Schol. Theoc.* 1604, 249

Fr. 28 (*SH* 675D)

Ἄχναι

Steph. Byz. 342.17 Mein. Ἴχναι· πόλις Μακεδονίας. Ἡρόδοτος ἑβδόμῃ (7.123.3). Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ Ἄχνας αὐτήν φησι. Φιλητᾶς (plurr.: Φιλίτας V) δ' ἄλλην (: Ἄχνην Xylander, frustra) φησὶ διὰ (<τὴν> διὰ Mein.) τοῦ ᾱ.

Hermes

I. *Commentary*

Fr. 1

1.1a. Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀλώμενος περὶ Σικελίαν καὶ τὴν Τυρρηνῶν καὶ τὴν Σικελῶν θάλασσαν These introductory lines explicitly place Aeolus' island in the west. Odysseus' wanderings there are well founded on ancient testimonies beginning with Hes. *Theog.* 1011–16 and *Spuria* fr. 390, and this location was advanced in Hellenistic times among others by Call. and A.R.[1] P. might use this opportunity to hint at his view on what was a vivid issue in his days.[2] In contrast to Crates (cf. *Sphairop.* fr. 31 Mette), Aristarchus seems to have believed that the Homeric geography is fictitious (see Lehrs 241f., A. Buonajuto, *A&R* 41 (1996), 4–5), but his Πρὸς Φιλίταν is not likely to have dealt with such broad questions. — The Tyrrhenian and the Sicilian are two successive seas in the SW of Italy, the limits of which are not always precisely defined, cf. Thuc. 4.24.5 ἐκ μεγάλων πελάγων, τοῦ τε Τυρσηνικοῦ καὶ τοῦ Σικελικοῦ and see K.-D. Fabian, *KlP* V.1030 s.v. Tyrrhenum mare.

1.1b. ἀλώμενος is a poetic word. It is constructed with different prepositions (see *DGE* s.v.), but ἀλώμενος περί + accusative is surely prosaic, cf. *Erot. path.* 15.2 περὶ τὴν Ἠλιδίαν ἀλωμένης, 36.4 περὶ αὐτὸν (*sc.* τὸν τόπον) ἀλωμένη, Luc. *Dial. mar.* 13.1 περὶ τὰς ὄχθας ἀλύουσα, Long. 1.28.1 ἀλύοντα περὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, also Parmen. 28 B 14 D-K (moon) περὶ γαῖαν ἀλώμενον . . φῶς, further *Erot. path.* 30 ἀλώμενον διὰ τῆς Κελτῶν χώρας. The verb itself, a *vox propria* to describe sea-wanderings, often applies to Odysseus, see Garvie on

---

[1] Timaeus' treatment (see ff. n. 15) may have had a bearing on P., as in fr. 22. For Odysseus in the West cf. A.R. 3.311–2, 4.849–50 with Campbell on the former passage, Call. frr. 13, 470 rebuffed by Apollodorus of Athens συνηγορῶν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἐρατοσθένη, *FGrH* 244 F 157. On the whole question see E. D. Phillips, "Odysseus in Italy", *JHS* 73 (1953), 53–67, F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie*, Munich 1979, 156f.

[2] See F. Prontera, "Sull' esegesi ellenistica della geographia omerica" in G. W. Most, *al.* (edd.), *Philanthropia kai Eusebeia. Festschrift für A. Dihle*, Göttingen 1993, 387–97. Antimachus was also one of those who believed in the geographical veracity of the Homeric poems, cf. fr. 180. H. H. and A. Wolf, *Der Weg des Odysseus*, Munich ²1990 gather ancient and modern theories on the question.

Od. 6.206 and cf. *Od.* 8.28 ξεῖνος . . . ἀλώμενος ἵκετ' ἐμὸν δῶμα, Theoc. 16.51.

1.1c. ἀφίκετο πρὸς Αἴολον καὶ Μελιγουνίδα νῆσον Cf. *Od.* 10.1 Αἰολίην δ' ἐς νῆσον ἀφικόμεθ' whence Q.S. 14.474 (Iris) ἵκετο δ' Αἰολίην etc. ἀφικνέομαι often initiates a hospitality scene (Reece 13). Parth. writes ἀφικνέομαι πρός + accusative (here and 7.3) or παρά + accusative (17.4, 30.1) for persons, ἐπί + accusative (8.8) and mostly εἰς + accusative for places (5.5, 8.3, 18.1, 34.1, 36.1 – 16.2 εἰς Δάρδανον ἀφικέσθαι is an exception), cf. 1.1 ἀφικόμενος δὲ εἰς Καῦνον πρὸς Αἰγιαλόν, 1.3 ἀφίκετο εἰς Βύβαστον πρὸς Στάφυλον. This might favour Bast's dactylic εἰς for P's καί. The verbal echoes of the *Od.* in Parth. may well be filtered through P. They suggest that he openly associated his own treatment with the Homeric one.

1.1d. Μελιγουνίδα νῆσον Lipara, the biggest of the Aeolian islands, was commonly identified as the house of Aeolus, cf. Antiochus Syr. Σικελικά *FGrH* 555 F 1, who is sceptical, Thuc. 3.88, Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 164(7.6), Virg. *A.* 8.416–7 *Aeoliamque/. . . Liparen*, see K. Ziegler, *RE* XIII.2.719–21. Meligounis is its ancient name, which other erudite poets used as well. Schneider 1856, 47 n. 2 suggested that this phrase is a quotation from P. (fr. 1a). The Aeolian islands were located in the Tyrrhenian sea near Sicily, cf. the *hypothesis* of Eur. *Aeolus* 22 (C. Austin, *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea*, Berlin 1968, 88) ἀνῴκησεν ἐν ταῖς κατὰ Τυρρηνίαν νήσοις which goes back to Euripides, whence Sostrat. *FGrH* 23 F 3 Αἴολος, τῶν κατὰ Τυρρηνίαν βασιλεὺς τόπων, Plut. *Par. min.* 312c, see Ll-J, *Gnomon* 35 (1963), 444. The following ὃς αὐτόν signifies the commencement of the main story.

1.1e. κατὰ κλέος (σοφίας) Parth. 36.1 has (Rhesus goes to Cius) κατὰ κλέος γυναικὸς καλῆς, but the phrase is dactylic and it may be a focalisation from the original. It first occurs in a reception scene in Pind. *P.* 4.124–5 where Jason arrives at Iolcus καὶ κασίγνητοί σφισιν ἀμφότεροι/ἤλυθον κείνου γε κατὰ κλέος, whence A.R. would pick it up in 2.754 when, after the battle with the Bebryces, the Mariandyni take notice of the Argonauts κατὰ κλέος ὃ πρὶν ἄκουον. A warm reception follows in which the guests narrate their adventures and the pleased host, king Lycos, at the end rewards them by sending along his son to guarantee safe passage for a long journey. The affinities between the Philitan episode and the one in A.R. would indicate that the latter may not ignore P. Cf. also an echo

in Ael. *VH* 14.46b ἀφίκετο ἐξ Ἑλλησπόντου παρὰ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἑταίραν <τὴν> Γνάθαιναν ἐραστὴς ἀνὴρ κατὰ κλέος αὐτῆς. Homer has only μετὰ κλέος, *Il.* 11.227 'at the news of' where Σ D μετὰ τὴν ἀκοὴν . . . κληδόνα ἢ φήμην ἀκούσας, 13.364 'in search of κλέος' where Aristoph. Byz. introduced κατὰ κλέος. κλέος is a heroic term (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 487), which is rewarding in more peaceful times, cf. Hes. fr. 199.9 (suitors of Helen) πολλὰ δ' ἔεδν[α δίδον,] μέγα γὰρ κλέος [ἔσκε γυ]ναικός.

1.1f. σοφίας In a story ending in a similarly embarrassing disappointment of the host, Croesus welcomes Solon in Hdt. 1.30.2 ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, παρ' ἡμέας γὰρ περὶ σέο λόγος ἀπῖκται πολλὸς καὶ σοφίης εἵνεκεν τῆς σῆς καὶ πλάνης. — In the *Odyssey* the hero is twice regarded by his hosts as πεπνυμένος, in 8.388 by Alcinous and in 19.350 by Penelope. σοφός is an addition to his stock of qualities, often with a negative colouring, as early as Stesich. *PMGF* S 89.8 (sack of Troy), then Pind. fr. 260.7 (Odysseus than Palamedes) κυριώτερο[ιείς σοφίας λόγον, Soph. *Aj.* 1374, *Phil.* 440, 1244, fr. 913 <τὸ> πάνσοφον κρότημα, Λαέρτου γόνος, Eur. *Cyc.* 450, Antisth. XIX 10.7, *al.* Radermacher, Plut. *Bruta rat. uti* 992e, Philostr. Jun. *Imag.* 1.5. This unheroic feature of Odysseus' character would appeal to P. (Stesich. *l.l.* seems to imply that Odysseus sacked Troy not by means of war, but due to his σοφία). Of a different nature is that Stoics regarded Odysseus as a model of wisdom, cf. Heracl. *All.* 70.7, Hor. *Epist.* 1.2.18f. *quid sapientia possit/utile proposuit nobis exemplar Ulixen* with R. Mayer ad loc. σοφία, initially 'skill', developed to be an ambiguous term of cleverness used on cunning purposes (see Dover on Ar. *Nub.* 331 on the parallel evolution of σοφιστής), and in Theogn. 218 σοφίη denotes the ability to show flexibility according to the situation, as opposed to ἀτροπίη (Stanford 91 thought that this "clearly alludes to the Homeric Odysseus"). The word here retains its ambiguous power.

1.1g. τεθηπώς The reputation of Odysseus' σοφία has an effect of astonishment and admiration on the part of Aeolus. The hero occasionally displays a charisma causing similar feelings, as in *Od.* 7.145, 8.17–8 to the Phaeacians, 8.459 to Nausicaa, 16.178 to Telemachus, 24.392 to his loyals or *Il.* 3.224 to his audience during a former embassy to Troy, despite his humble appearance (ἀγασσάμεθα 'admired' Aristarchus, but see Kirk ad loc. 'were surprised or annoyed at'), *Il.* 23.728 to the spectators of his treacherous wrestling with

Aias, and even more so when he has the help of a god, as might be the case here. θάμβος is usually caused by sight (Campbell on A.R. 3.215), exceptionally by hearing, cf. Hdt. 2.156.2 τέθηπα δὲ ἀκούων (of a πλωτὴ νῆσος), or by both, cf. *Il.* 24.631–2 Πρίαμον θαύμαζεν Ἀχιλλεύς,/εἰσορόων ὄψίν τ' ἀγαθὴν καὶ μῦθον ἀκούων, particularly when a character delivers a speech of miraculous content, cf. Plato *Symp.* 208b (Socrates of Diotima) ἀκούσας τὸν λόγον ἐθαύμασα, *ibid.* 215d, Bacch. 5.84, Call. fr. 43.85 (the poet listens to the erudite Muses and wants to learn more) ἦ γάρ μοι θάμβος ὑπετρέφ[ετ]ο, Orph. *Arg.* 1158 (Medea) ὧδε δ' ἔφη, θάμβος δὲ . . . ἵκετο πάντας. τέθηπα is a verb associated with the vacant stare of a slow-reacting person or animal and its original meaning seems to have been 'remain speechless' (A. Blanc, "L'accablement et la stupefaction, κατηφής et τέθηπα" in *Mélanges Taillardat*, 38–40). Most of the speaking part seems to be performed by Odysseus. Aeolus, impressed by his guest, is reported as only posing questions (διεπυνθάνετο). — τέθηπα occurs only here in the *Erot. path.* and it is not trivialised to become prosaic until the 2nd cent. AD. It is an epic form which might hark back to P., cf. τετρήχασιν in fr. 4.3, see in general Ch. R. Barton, "Greek τέθηπα etc.", *Glotta* 81 (1993), 1–9 and contrast Parth. 30.2 (Heracles) τὸ κάλλος ἐκπλαγέντα τῆς κόρης. Lightfoot 383 would consider it as another ionicism of Parth. *cl.* Hdt. *l.c.*

1.1h. ἐν πολλῇ φροντίδι εἶχε is Parthenian, 9.6 ἐν πολλῇ φροντίδι ἐγίγνετο, perhaps from Hdt. 1.88.1 (Cyrus impressed by his guest Croesus) κάρτα ἐν πολλῇ προμηθίῃ εἶχε, ἀπεθώμαζέ τε ὁρέων καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ περὶ ἐκεῖνον ἐόντες πάντες, cf. also Thuc. 1.55.1 (of prisoners) ἐν θεραπείᾳ εἶχον πολλῇ. It is twice pointed out that Aeolus took the best of care of his guest, see 11 ξενίζων. This is founded on Odyssean grounds, but in view of Odysseus' secret dealings with Polymele it gains further in significance. The irony would intensify, if Aeolus would praise Odysseus with remarks of comic irony such as those of Alcinous in *Od.* 11.363f.

1.1i. τά <τε> περὶ Τροίης ἅλωσιν καὶ ὃν τρόπον αὐτοῖς ἐσκεδάσθησαν αἱ νῆες κομιζομένοις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰλίου διεπυνθάνετο The interests of Philitan Aeolus are well in accordance with his Odyssean ones, *Od.* 10.14–5 ἐξερέεινεν ἕκαστα,/Ἴλιον Ἀργείων τε νέας καὶ νόστον Ἀχαιῶν. Odysseus is requested to narrate two non-Homeric events and isolated Aeolus is eager to learn details, cf. διεπυνθάνετο ~ *Od.* 10.14 ἐξερέεινεν ἕκαστα. Presumably, a reference to other heroes'

nosti would function as an easy transition to Odysseus' own, by far longer and more distressful sufferings. Aeolus, neither in the *Od.* nor in Parth., is reported to have specifically asked about them, as hosts usually do, cf. Alcinous in *Od.* 8.572f., Eumaeus in *Od.* 14.185f., Dido in Virg. *A.* 1.753f. and see Reece 25–8.

1.1j. Τροίης ἅλωσιν Cf. 16.4 μετὰ Τροίας ἅλωσιν. ἅλωσις is un-Homeric, but it became the *vox propria* for the sack of a city and in particular of that of Troy, cf. Stesich. *PMGF* S 89.11 Τρο<ί>ας ἁλώσι̣[μον ἆμαρ ~ Ibyc. *PMGF* S 151.14–5, Aesch. *Ag.* 589 ἅλωσιν Ἰλίου ~ Soph. *Phil.* 61, Pind. fr. 52f.81–2, Hdt. 1.5.1, Soph. *Trach.* 288, Eur. *Hec.* 1135 Τρωικὴ ἅλωσις, Plato *Leg.* 685c and later Triph. Ἰλίου ἅλωσις, which B. Gerlaud (*Triphiodore, La prise d'Ilion*, Budé 1982, 10) regards as innovative with reference to the numerous *Ilioupersides.*

1.1k. τῆς Ἰλίου The feminine is in compliance with the Homeric norm (Hainsworth on *Il.* 12.115) except *Il.* 15.71 αἰπὺ Ἴλιον, where Aristarchus proposed an emendation to delete the neuter, which Zenodotus had previously essayed to introduce also in *Il.* 16.92 and 18.174, see Janko on *Il.* 16.89–96, Rengakos 1993, 94–5. The neuter, nevertheless, prevailed in tragedy — the feminine in Eur. *Andr.* 103 is a deliberate epicism among others in that passage — and Hellenistic poets sometimes use it, e.g. Call. fr. 186.20.

1.1l. ξενίζων τε αὐτὸν πολὺν χρόνον διῆγεν Cf. *Od.* 10.14 μῆνα δὲ πάντα φίλει με, 23.314–5 Αἴολον ἵκεθ', ὅ μιν πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο/καὶ πέμπ'. ξενίζω is a technical term denoting reception and entertainment of a guest according to proper etiquette. In Sicily, Aeolus had a name for his hospitable attitude, Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 164(7.7) γενέσθαι δ' αὐτόν φασιν εὐσεβῆ καὶ δίκαιον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ξένους φιλάνθρωπον. Friendly reception answered with ingratitude is a typical motif in Parth.'s stories.

1.2a. τῷ δ' ἄρα καὶ αὐτῷ ἦν ἡ μονὴ ἡδομένῳ Sometimes the host detains his visitor more than he wishes, and hospitality becomes unpleasant and embarrassing (cf. *Od.* 15.72f., Theoc. 16.27f. and see Reece 34–5), whereas Odysseus is capable of entertaining a host for a considerable period, cf. *Od.* 14.192–8 and see M. J. Apthorp, *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 19. In Parth. Aeolus' long detaining becomes pleasant thanks to Polymele. — The wording is surely prosaic, cf. 32.1 ἡ δὲ ἄρα καὶ αὐτή, Hdt. 1.111.1 τῷ δ' ἄρα καὶ αὐτῷ (Lightfoot 384). P. E. Sonnenburg *apud* Nowacki 32 n. 5, who thought that *Hermes*

consisted of pentameters as well as of hexameters, proposed a Philitan pentameter τῷ δ' ἄρα καὐτῷ ἔην ἡ μονὴ ἡδομένῳ, "quem reciperem, nisi res nimis incerta esset" Nowacki *l.c.* This is excluded by the fact that *Hermes* was a hexameter poem. Besides, μονή, although it comes up in drama, is non-epic, non-Hellenistic and securely Parthenian (cf. 36.2), probably picked from Hdt. 1.94.5. Nonetheless, the dactylic-sounding expression and ironic tone ("Aeolus kept him a long time asking this and that; but he did not have a bad time either") might depict a relevant remark in the Philitan prototype: wit, as of Hermes and Odysseus, would be the spirit of the poem.

1.2b. Αἰολίδων There is a consistent use of Αἰολίδης -αι for the male, Αἰολίς for the female offspring of Aeolus. For the former cf. Hes. fr. 10a.25, 43a.75, Call. fr. 618, A.R. 1.121, *al.*, and in the genitive plural Pind. *P.* 4.72, A.R. 3.339 (note the various accentuations of the MSS), Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 964.16 (Parth.?) Αἰολιδέων. For the latter cf. Hes. fr. 10a.103 Αἰολίς, here, Call. *HyDem.* 99, and then in Latin poetry, Ov. *Epist.* 11.1, 5 *al., Met.* 11.573, see Bömer on *Met.* 11.444. The last would go back to a Hellenistic source. Feminine patronymics (and toponymics) in -ίς are an affectation of early Hellenistic poetry, see Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 44 and on patronymics in -(ί)δας/-(ί)δης M. B. G. Keurentjes, *Mnemosyne* iv 50 (1997), 385–400.

1.2c. ἐρασθεῖσα αὐτοῦ "Die Antike kennt nur Liebe auf den ersten Blick", Kroll on Cat. 64.86. As is usual with the women surrounding Odysseus, it is Polymele *sua sponte* who falls in love with him. Since P. seems to borrow features from the Phaeacian books of the *Od.*, Polymele's sudden love might have been advanced by an intervention of Hermes in a role akin to that performed by Athena in *Od.* 6.13f.

1.2d. κρύφα συνῆν is Parthenian, 35.1 ταύτῃ κρύφα συνὼν ἐλελήθει. The secret meetings of Odysseus and Polymele would probably take place during the night. Hermes would secure privacy. In *Il.* 24.343–4 with his wand ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα θέλγει/ὧν ἐθέλει (cf. *Od.* 5.47, 24.3, Hippon. *IEG* 177, Nonn. *D.* 35.234f.), as he is a god closely associated with sleep, cf. *Od.* 7.136–8, Athen. 1.16b, Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 714c, Heliod. 3.5 and see Livrea on A.R. 4.1733 on Hermes as ἡγήτωρ ὀνείρων. Note also that Alcinous in *Od.* 7.346 sleeps μυχῷ δόμου ὑψηλοῖο 'in the innermost recess of his lofty house'.

1.2e. τοὺς ἀνέμους ἐγκεκλεισμένους παραλαβών Cf. *Od.* 10.19–20 δῶκε δέ μοι ἐκδείρας ἀσκὸν βοὸς ἐννεώροιο,/ἔνθα δὲ βυκτάων ἀνέμων κατέδησε κέλευθα. Odysseus is a character most competent in extracting gifts. In *Od.* 8.381 he flatters Alcinous, who in response urges the Phaeacians to grant gifts to their *xeinos*. Aeolus, as in the *Od.*, would voluntarily place his capacities at his guest's disposal.

1.2f. ἀπέπλευσε Odysseus' departure constitutes a turning point in the evolution of the episode: the central figure goes off stage. It is a turning point for P.'s sources too: having got rid of Odysseus he now turns to Eur. *Aeolus*. What follows is of much interest to Parth., who needs to narrate a complete story, but perhaps less so for *Hermes*: in the original it might have been exposed in brief. All traces of poetic diction disappear after ἀλινδουμένη, though Parthenian parallels keep on coming up.

1.2g. κόρη The term is used of young women often implying innocence and virginity (contrast Polymele's attidute). Its employment could go back to P. as one of the elements that he picks up from the Phaeacian books of the *Od.* Nausicaa is called κούρη in these books and in direct address Odysseus begins with the reverent *Od.* 6.149, 175 ἄνασσα and ends up with *Od.* 8.468 κούρη.[3]

1.2h. φωρᾶται evidences the first trace of Eur. *Aeolus*. In that tragedy Aeolus finds out about the offspring of the secret liaison between two of his children, Macareus and Canace. In Sostrat. *FGrH* 23 F 3 the incident is simply described as Αἴολος δὲ περὶ τούτων μαθὼν etc., but this must have been a highly dramatic moment as we gather from the *hypothesis* 33–4 συνδραμόντες δ' εἰς τὸ αὐτ[ο/κọυτ̣ (: τοῦτον Luppe) [....]ọι τὸ μὲν γεννηθὲν ἡ τροφὸς σ[, see W. Luppe, *Philologus* 116 (1982), 17–8. φωράομαι, a verb commonly disclosing furtive dealings, comes up once more in Parth. 34.1 φωράσας δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ ἀνεῖλεν.

[3] A regretted status? In the Phaeacian books Nausicaa is called by name 9x (6.17, 25, 186, 213, 251, 276, 7.12, 8.457, 464). As κούρη she appears 13x (6.15, 20, 47, 74, 78, 113, 142, 147, 223, 237, 7.2, 303, 8.468), cf. παρθένος ἀδμής in 6.109 with Garvie ad loc., 6.228 and the group of girls called κοῦραι in 6.122, 135, 222. Alcinous calls her 6.68 τέκος, 7.300 παῖς ἐμή. In *Od.* 18.279 Penelope is called κούρη.

1.2i. τινὰ τῶν Τρωικῶν λαφύρων ἔχουσα This is a most witty device of P.: the Trojan spoils replace the new-born child of *Aeolus*. A motif from Euripides is interwined with the Homeric background of the story. The heroic is a strongly acquisitive society, but Odysseus well exceeds the average.[4] Clearly, he is not the ideal of generosity. His comrades complain about sailing back with empty hands! Their jealousy drives them to open the wind-sack of Aeolus, *Od.* 10.38–45 — an act which Odysseus *a priori* condemns as "foolish" (10.27 ἀφραδίῃσιν). As a result, the unleashed winds drive them back to Aeolus, who is no longer willing to offer help. Odysseus' Homeric stinginess and its repercussions stand in ironic contrast to his untypical generosity with Polymele. Contrast Odysseus' thrift as a suitor of Helen, Hes. fr. 198.4–6 δῶρα μὲν οὔ ποτ' ἔπεμπε τανισφύρου εἵνεκα κούρης·/ᾔδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ὅτι ξανθὸς Μενέλαος/νικήσει, κτήνῳ γὰρ Ἀχαιῶν φέρτατος ἦεν.

1.2j. μετὰ πολλῶν δακρύων ὀδύρομαι (e.g. ὀδύρετο . . Ὀδυσσῆος) would produce a witty effect, as the verb is often linked with the name of Odysseus, see Rutherford on *Od.* 19.265–7 *ad fin.* and on 3b *ad fin.* on ἐκάκισεν.

1.2k. τούτοις . . . ἀλινδουμένη Parth.'s natural choice would be the common prosaic κυλινδέομαι so that ἀλινδουμένη looks like reproducing diction from the original. The orthodox epic form (the only one in Homer, early Lyric, A.R., Imperial Epic) is κυλίνδομαι. The poetic careers of ἀλινδέομαι and ἀλίνδομαι are confined to Hellenistic poetry (both disappear in Imperial poetry) and Parth.'s passage suggests that it first found a place in learned poets' vocabulary in P. He would rather employ the recherché ἀλίνδομαι than Parth.'s commoner ἀλινδέομαι.[5] He may not have strayed from its Homeric par-

---

[4] See J. Griffin, *The Odyssey*, Cambridge 1986, 94–5, Russo on *Od.* 19.271–87, Rutherford on *Od.* 19.185, I. N. Perysinakis, "Η λειτουργία του πλούτου στην πλοκή της Οδύσσειας του Ομήρου" in *Εὐχὴν Ὀδυσσεῖ, Πρακτικά Ζ' Συνεδρίου για την Οδύσσεια*, Ithace 1995, 287–314.

[5] Nic. *Ther.* 156, 204 uses both. ἀλίνδομαι comes up only in Nic. *Ther.* 156, Leon. Tar. *HE* 33.2. ἀλινδέομαι is lighter, Call. *Iambi* fr. 191.42, Herodas 5.30, (mostly) late prose. The earlier form is ἀλίνδω (G-P on Leon. Tar. *l.c.* are incorrect in asserting the opposite), as is κυλίνδω, but the frequentative form prevailed, as did κυλινδέω, see Chantraine *DE* s.v. ἀλίνδω, Headlam-Knox on Herodas 5.30, Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 191.42, *DGE* s.vv. ἀλινδέομαι, ἀλίνδομαι.

allel κυλίνδομαι. It is only in the participle that this form occurs in Leon. Tar., Nic. *ll. cc.*

The verb may recall in ironic contrast Odysseus' reaction when he heard he had to descend to Hades in *Od.* 10.499 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίων τε κυλινδόμενος τε κορέσθην etc. Call. *Iambi* fr. 191.42 μέλλοντας ἤδη παρθένοις ἀλινδεῖσθαι and Herodas 5.30–1 πρὸς 'Αμφυταίην ταῦτα, . . ./μετ' ἧς ἀλινδῇ use it with an erotic sense, cf. also Alciphr. 2.28.2, Nonn. *D.* 10.371–2 (Dionysus and his beloved Ampelos wrestling) κυλινδομένων δὲ κονίῃ/ἀμφοτέρων etc. (love as wrestling: Davies on Soph. *Trach.* 441–2, Hollis 1998, 73 n. 6), Hsch. η 367 ἠλίνδησε· κατεπάλαισεν. The rolling around of Polymele expresses an erotic despair and suggests the image of love-making. Within context it might refer to 'whirling' diction which, as fr. 4 indicates, P. had employed in an ambiguous fashion. — The construction with dative has seemed awkward, but is sound: the meaning is not that Polymele is rolling *among* Odysseus' gifts, i.e. κἀν τούτοις ἀλινδουμένη as L. Kayser proposed, but rolling *with* Odysseus' gifts, i.e. Polymele has taken them in her embrace. Besides, the construction is securely paralleled with Call. *l.c.* παρθένοις ἀλινδεῖσθαι, where, as once Kayser in Parth., R. Kassel (*RhM* n.s. 112 (1969), 100 = *Kl. Schr.*, 373) proposed ἤδη <'ν> παρθένοις.

1.3a. καίπερ οὐ παρόντα signifies a difference to *Od.* 10.71f. where Aeolus scolds Odysseus face to face. It also points out the hero's ability to dodge the punishment he deserves. Contrast his fate to that of Polymele: τὸν μὲν 'Οδυσσέα . . . ἐκάκισεν, τὴν δὲ Πολυμήλην . . . τείσασθαι. R. Herzog, *Philologus* 79 (1924), 411 regarded "die Entfesselung der Winde als Strafe für die heimliche Liebesschaft", but Aeolus' telepathetic capabilities seem unsubstantiated.

1.3b. ἐκάκισεν *Od.* 10.72–5 give us a clue as to what Aeolus might have said. Other characters in Parthenian stories show respect to their hosts and decline to give in to a secret affair, such as Antheus in 14.2 or Promedon in 18.1. Odysseus displays a similar attitude in *Erot. path.* 3, see ff. In Greek terms, his act constitutes a disgraceful insult to Aeolus, cf. Menelaus in *Il.* 3.353–4 and contrast the fate of centaur Eurytion in Bacch. fr. 44 ἐπιξενωθέντα Δεξαμενῷ ἐν 'Ήλιδι ὑβριστικῶς ἐπιχειρῆσαι τῇ τοῦ ξενοδοχοῦντος θυγατρί, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπὸ 'Ηρακλέους ἀναιρεθῆναι καιρίως τοῖς οἴκοις ἐπιστάντος. — The popular etymology of Odysseus' name from ὀδύσσομαι 'be angry with', already advanced by his godfather Autolycus in *Od.* 19.406–9

and alluded to several times in the *Od.* (see Rutherford ad loc., S. West on *Od.* 1.62) and occasionally later (cf. Soph. fr. 965), could be employed in this context.

1.3c. τὴν δὲ Πολυμήλην ἐν νῷ ἔσχε τείσασθαι The wording is Parthenian, 14.2 ἐν νῷ εἶχε τείσασθαι αὐτόν, 8.8 ἐν νῷ δὲ εἶχεν αὐτὴν τείσασθαι, with which Lightfoot 385 compares Hdt. 1.10.2 ἐν νόῳ ἔχουσα τείσασθαι τὸν Κανδαύλεα. Here again we stand on tragic ground. Aeolus' anger is a Euripidean element, perhaps enriched in P. with grotesque overtones, see fr. 5. It must have played a key-role in Eur., where in view of the disastrous outcome of his wrath Aeolus comes up with a fitting maxim, fr. 31 Kannicht ὀργῇ γὰρ ὅστις εὐθέως χαρίζεται,/κακῶς τελευτᾷ· πλεῖστα γὰρ σφάλλει βροτούς. This was then taken up by Ov. *Her.* 11.15 *tumidae non imperat irae*, 73f. (74 *insana regia voce sonat*). We are not told how Aeolus was planning to punish his daughter in *Hermes*, but presumably P. used the sword-motif of Eur., as later did Ov. *Her.* 11.3, 93–100. There is a list of fathers punishing their daughters in their outrage about secret love-affairs in A.R. 4.1087–95 where the Σ (307.1 Wendel) refer to a Κατάλογος ἀσεβῶν by an undatable Lysippus of Epirus.

1.3d. ἔτυχε δὲ αὐτῆς ἠρασμένος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Διώρης The incestuous love between the children of Aeolus is already known to Homer. P. uses it to replace Eur.'s tragic finale with a happy end: this is suggestive of the nature of the stories treated in *Hermes*. With the exception of Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 964.15–6 (see p. 138f.) neither Diores nor Polymele are attested elsewhere as names of any of Aeolus' children, see Roscher i, 194 s.v. Aeolus (3). P. avoids traditional names, which were bound to have a rather confusing effect. Instead, he turns to the *Il.* Diores occurs 3x in the *Il.* (2.622, 4.517, 17.429), see von Kamptz 88, Kirk on *Il.* 4.517. Polymele, appearing only once in *Il.* 16.180 (cf. Trojan Polymelos in *Il.* 16.417), is a choice not without significance, see p. 132.

1.3e. αὐτὴν παραιτεῖται 'begs off punishment for her', see *LSJ* s.v. παραιτέω III (thirteen certain occurrences of this verb in Hdt.). As Macareus in Eur., Diores pleads for Polymele to be spared.

1.3f. καὶ πείθει τὸν πατέρα αὐτῷ συνοικίσαι Cf. the *hypothesis* of *Aeolus* 27–8 ὁ δ̣ὲ̣ νεανίσκος ἔπεισε τὸν πατέρα [τὰς θυγα-]/τέρας συνοικίσαι τοῖς υἱοῖς. The groom normally had to extract the assent of both his father (cf. Men. *Dysc.* 784–7 and see D. MacDowell, *The*

Law in Classical Athens, London 1978, 86) and the father of the bride. τὸν πατέρα here is tantalisingly vague, as Aeolus comprises both qualities ("their father" Stern and Lightfoot, "his father" Gaselee). Contrast the plural in 10.1 Κυάνιππος . . . εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν Λευκώνης ἐλθών, παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αἰτησάμενος αὐτὴν ἠγάγετο γυναῖκα.

1.3g. συνοικίσαι συνοικίζω is a *terminus technicus* meaning 'give permission to cohabit as husband and wife', συνοικεῖν being the verb to denote the actual state of marital cohabitation, see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law at Athens*, Oxford 1968, 2.

The next chapter in Parth., entitled Περὶ Εὐίππης and notated ἱστορεῖ Σοφοκλῆς Εὐρυάλῳ, begins in an unusual way: Οὐ μόνον δὲ Ὀδυσσεὺς περὶ Αἴολον ἐξήμαρτεν, ἀλλά etc. Maass 1894, 2 postulated a common source, but the unusual transition is due to the affinity of chs. 2 and 3 and shows that Parth. conceived his collection as a unity, cf. ch. 22 (which shares a theme with ch. 21) Ἔφασαν δέ τινες καὶ τὴν Σαρδίων ἀκρόπολιν ὑπὸ Κύρου . . . ἁλῶναι. In the first part of ch. 3, which gives the background of the main story (Odysseus' murder of Euryalus, an illegitimate child of his), the hero τὴν Τυρίμμα θυγατέρα ἔφθειρεν Εὐίππην, ὅς αὐτὸν οἰκείως τε ὑπεδέξατο καὶ μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας ἐξένιζεν. This story shows again how easily inappropriate behaviour towards his hosts was ascribed to Odysseus (the *Nosti*-sagas may have credited Odysseus with fathering a number of children on his way back home, cf. *Nosti* Dubia et Spuria *EGF* 1), but it is unlikely to have functioned as a model for P., whose story was conceived to stand within its Odyssean context. The motif could have been popular in Hellenistic times and it is rather on such a source that Parth. may draw: Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1796.50 says that in Soph.'s play (*TrGF* iv, 194–5) Euryalus was killed by Telemachus, not Odysseus as in Parth.

Fr. 1a

Schneider 1856, 47 n. 2 suggested that (εἰς) Μελιγουνίδα νῆσον is a phrase extracted from the Philitan prototype (clausula?). Among a number of instances likely to reflect the original (most notable is ἀλινδουμένη in par. 2), this is the most obvious one (note the dactylic form of the clause). Μελιγουνίς is the ancient name of Λιπάρη (modern Lipari) which attracted some attention from the erudite poets, Call. *HyDian.* 47–8 νήσῳ ἐνὶ Λιπάρῃ (Λιπάρη νέον, ἀλλὰ τότ' ἔσκεν/

οὔνομά οἱ Μελιγουνίς), where the parenthesis seems to refer directly to P. (Λιπάρ[α, most probably, in *Aet.* fr. 115.20 and *Dieg.* 3.13 on fr. 93), Euph. *CA* 51.8–9 ἤ που θερμάστραις ἤ που Μελιγουνίδι τοῖαι/ μαρμαρυγαί.[6] P.'s attention to Meligounis may be advanced by the fact that it was a Cnidian colony, cf. Antiochus Syr. Σικελικά *FGrH* 555 F 1, *CEG* 832.i (Lipara, 475–450 BC), Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 164(9), and that a cult of a 'Tyrrhenian' ithyphallic Hermes existed in the area, cf. Call. *Iambi* fr. 199. Regional history is a Peripatetic interest. Heraclides Ponticus wrote a Περὶ νήσων in which names appear to have played an important part, cf. frr. 126–7. According to Suidas, Call. published a Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων καὶ μετωνομασίαι (p. 339 Pf., cf. *id. SH* 291A). The Cyrenean's interest in antiquarian names is well attested in frr. 580–5, 599, *HyDel.* 36–7 with Mineur ad loc. and see Massimilla on *Aet.* (his) fr. 119.4 ἐν Δίῃ· τὸ γὰρ ἔσκε παλαίτερον οὔνομα Νάξῳ. Passages such as Hdt. 1.173.2–3 on Lycia's names indicate that this fell within the interests of Ionian ethnographers, so that consolidated information on this subject may have been available, cf. Strabo 10.2.17 about Samos (from Apollod. of Athens?). Onomatology seems to have been the first subject treated by poems dealing with a certain region, cf. Euph. *Mopsopia CA* 34 on Athens or Rhian. *Thessalica CA* 25 on Thessaly. For Parth. cf. *Erot. path.* 19 νήσου τῆς πρότερον μὲν Στρογγύλης, ὕστερον δὲ Νάξου κληθείσης, which goes back to the original (according to the notation Andriscus *Naxiaca FGrH* 500 F 2, a 3rd cent. BC historian). An excerpt about the Aeolian islands from an ancient geographical guide survives in PMich. xviii.760 (pap. saec. p.C. I/II, ed. T. Renner, Amsterdam 1996, 5–15).

---

[6] Cf. Strabo 6.2.10 (from Timaeus?) Λιπάρα, Κνιδίων ἄποικος . . . ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ πρότερον Μελιγουνὶς . . . ὑπηκόους ἔχουσα τὰς νῦν λεγομένας Λιπαραίων νήσους, ἃς Αἰόλου τινὲς προσαγορεύουσι, Pliny *NH* 3.93 *Lipara . . . antea Milogounis vel Meligunis vocitata.* With reference to Call. *l.c.* cf. Hsch. μ 699 Μελιγουνίς· οὕτως ἡ Λιπάρα ἐκαλεῖτο νῆσος, Steph. Byz. 442.9 Μελιγουνίς, 418.8 Λιπάρα, Σ Thuc. 3.88.2 Λιπάρα: αὕτη τὸ παλαιὸν Μελιγουνὶς ἐκαλεῖτο, Comm. PAnt. on Call. *l.c.* (II.53.6 Pf.), Σ PCair. on *ibid.* (II.55.1 Pf.) Μελιγουν(ὶς) τὸ πρότερο(ν) ἐκαλεῖτο | ἡ νῦν Λιπάρα. The ancient commentaries of Call. would not fail to quote P. here. The nomenclature of the Aeolian islands is discussed by G. Libertini, *Le isole Eolie nell'antichita greca e romana*, Florence 1921, 9f.

Fr. 2

This fragment is ascribed to *Hermes* by Stobaeus. Its gnomic content suggests that it is delivered by a character, not the poet. Despite Hunter 1993, 114 n. 55, Aeolus is unlikely to console Odysseus with the possible but unsuitable thought that if gods bow to *ananke*, then mortals have to do the same, thus displaying a miserable lack of compassion.[7] He does not seem to have said much either: Parth. says that he mostly asked questions. Odysseus, on the other hand, has good reasons to mention *ananke*, but perhaps not as part of his consolation to Polymele (Latacz 1999, 209): the fragment might refer to a deed the hero was *forced* to perform. γάρ in v. 1 would explain the necessity of accomplishing the task mentioned in the preceding lines. In situations like this *ananke* regularly turns up as a motivation: quite often in tragedy (see Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 514) and cf. Jason justifying κερδαλέοισιν his undertaking to kill the bulls of Aeetes in A.R. 3.428–31:

τῶ καὶ ἐγὼ τὸν ἄεθλον ὑπερφίαλόν περ ἐόντα
τλήσομαι, εἴ καί μοι θανέειν μόρος. οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄλλο
ῥίγιον ἀνθρώποισι κακῆς ἐπικείσετ' ἀνάγκης
ἥ με καὶ ἐνθάδε νεῖσθαι ἐπέχραεν ἐκ βασιλῆος.

Cf. also the Argonauts having to carry Argo through Libya's deserts ἀναγκαίῃ βεβιημένοι (4.1390) and Epich. fr. 66 (Heracles) ἀλλὰ μὰν ἐγὼν ἀνάγκᾳ πάντα ταῦτα ποιέω (followed by a proverb). A reference to Αἶσα is articulated in similar terms in Q.S. 3.649–51 (Calliope consoles Thetis) ἦ οὐκ ἀίεις ὅτι πάντας . . ./ἀνθρώπους ὀλοὴ περιπέπταται ἄσχετος Αἶσα/οὐδὲ θεῶν ἀλέγουσα, τόσον σθένος ἔλλαχε μούνη;/ἦ καὶ νῦν (will destroy the city of Priam). It would also be typical of Odysseus, who often justifies a deed of his by invoking the sheer necessity of the circumstance, as in *Od.* 6.136, 7.217, 10.273, *al.* The gods would be aptly brought up by Odysseus as an *a fortiori* consolatory parallel.[8]

The assonance of the novel construction χαλεπῶν ἀχέων and the twice repeated α-ε-ων sequence of sounds prompts Ἀχέρων, used as

[7] A primary virtue of any consoler, see W. Burkert, *Zum altgriechischen Mitleidsgefühl*, Diss. Erlangen 1955, 56f.

[8] Cf. *Il.* 18.117–21 for Achilleus invoking Heracles, beloved by Zeus, for the inevitability of his own death (see Edwards ad loc.), then *GVI* 1249.15–24 (2nd/1st cent. BC), 1935.15 (2nd cent. BC).

a synonym of Hades by Asclep. *HE* 2.3, Theoc. 12.19, 15.86, Call. fr. 191.35, see G-P on Bian. *GPh* 6.3 and cf. *IMEG* 32.4 (3rd cent. BC), *SEG* 27.328.6 (2nd cent. BC?). χαλεπός is often related to a deed that arouses indignation ('hard to bear'). Such was the reaction of Odysseus (*Od.* 10.496–9 — and of his companions, *Od.* 10.566–8) when Circe told him he had to undertake a journey to Hades. In *Od.* 11.622 χαλεποὺς . . ἀέθλους the adj. characterises the Hades journey of Heracles, imposed on him by Eurystheus. χαλεπός is also a variant of κρατερός on the same subject in *Od.* 10.582, 624, cf. *GVI* 768.7–8 (2nd cent. BC; death) χαλεπὸν . . ./ἄλγος, Q.S. 3.455 (death) χαλεποῖς ἐν πένθεσι. ἄχος is also a word closely associated with death or feelings engendered by death[9] and it was paretymologically connected with Ἀχέρων.[10] Odysseus seems to have insisted on his journey to Hades (cf. fr. 3, also *apud* Stobaeus) and he could have evoked *ananke* in this respect.

2.1a. ἰσχυρὰ . . . ἀνάγκη Epic diction demands κρατερή or κραταιή,[11] but its absence is mitigated by the following ἐπικρατεῖ. ἰσχυρός (and ἰσχύς) is unHomeric, occurring in poetry mostly in tragedy. The expression is unattested elsewhere in poetry,[12] but cf. Thales 11 A 1.35 D-K ἰσχυρότατον ἀνάγκη· κρατεῖ γὰρ πάντων, Eur. *Hel.* 514 δεινῆς ἀνάγκης οὐδὲν ἰσχύειν πλέον, Adesp. *TrGF* 502 (Eur.?) οὐδεὶς ἀνάγκης μεῖζον ἰσχύει νόμος, further [Aesch.] *Prom.* 105 τὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης σθένος, 514 τέχνη δ' ἀνάγκης ἀσθενεστέρα μακρῷ, Eur. *Alc.* 965–6 κρεῖσσον οὐδὲν Ἀνάγκας/ηὗρον, *id.* fr. 299 πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην πάντα τἄλλ' ἐστ' ἀσθενῆ. ἰσχυρά is here placed in an emphatic position.

2.1b. ἐπικρατεῖ Epic tradition demands ἐπίκειται viz. ἐπικείσεται, as *Il.* 6.458 κρατερὴ δ' ἐπικείσετ' ἀνάγκη·/(= *Orac. Sib.* 3.572), A.R.

---

[9] The feeling caused by the loss of a companion is ἄχος, *Il.* 4.169, 17.539, 18.22, *al.*, then *CEG* 11.4, 153.2 (both m. 5th cent. BC), see Hansen on *CEG* 714.5, Pers. *HE* 7.8, Theodor. *HE* 8.4. ἄχος was thought to underlie the Homeric formula θανάτοιο δυσηχέος, see Erbse (IV.491) on Σ T[il] (ex.) *Il.* 18.307 <δυσηχέος:> διὰ τοὺς ἀναιρουμένους, Campbell on A.R. 3.96.

[10] First in Aesch. *Ag.* 1557–58. Cf. Zenodotus *apud* EtG (AB) α 1508 Ἀχέρων· . . . εἴρηται μὲν ὁ τὰ ἄχεα ῥέων ἀχρέων, καὶ καθ' ὑπέρβιβασμόν Ἀχέρων. οὕτως Ζηνόδοτος καὶ Ἡρωδιανός, Apollod. Ath. *FGrH* 244 F 102a *cll.* Melanippid. *Persephone PMG* 759 and Licymn. *PMG* 770a, b, *id. FGrH* 244 F 102f.4, Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 207.31 (I.316 van der Valk, *q.v.*).

[11] Cf. *Il.* 6.458 (quoted in n. 1b), *Od.* 10.273 κρατερὴ δέ μοι ἔπλετ' ἀνάγκη, *HHAphr.* 130, Hes. *Theog.* 517, *Cypria EGF* 7.3, Theogn. 195, 387, Bacch. 11.46, fr. 20A.19–20, oracle in Hdt. 1.37.3 = 33.2 P-W, Adesp. *PMG* 1017.2, A.R. 2.18, *al.*

[12] The occurrences in prose are all of legal character, even Hdt. 1.74.4 ἄνευ γὰρ ἀναγκαίης ἰσχυρῆς συμβάσιες ἰσχυραὶ οὐκ ἐθέλουσι συμμένειν, cf. Antiphon 5.11, 6.25 and, despite Bonaldi 272, they may not have exercised influence on P.

3.430, cf. Paulus *Epist. Cor.* 1.9.16 ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπίκειται (*sc.* εὐαγγελίζεσθαι). ἐπικρατεῖν is a strong term ('prevails above anything else'), cf. Archil. *IEG* 115 and see J. L. Breuil in Casevitz 28, here particularly appropriate as it carries the threatening notion of the κράτος-derivatives.[13] — The verb may also prompt an underlying ἐπὶ κρατί, cf. Eur. *Her.* 640 (τὸ γῆρας) ἐπὶ κρατὶ κεῖται. A word-play on κράτος or its derivatives and κάρα would not be unparalleled, cf. Aesch. *ScTh* 412–3 σπαρτῶν δ' ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν . . ./ῥίζωμ' ἀνεῖται, κάρτα δ' ἔστ' ἐγχώριος, *ibid.* 940, A.R. 3.1297 κρατεροῖσιν . . . κεράεσσιν, 3.1307 (Jason drags the bulls by their horns) εἷλκεν ἐπικρατέως, Opp. *Hal.* 2.46 (swordfish's muzzle) κρατερὸν ἆορ, [*id.*] *Cyn.* 2.79, 94, 334 (sheep fighting with their foreheads) κρατερὸς δὲ δοῦπος πρὸς αἰθέρα ἱκάνει, Q.S. 6.216–9, 11.469 κρατερὴ τρυφάλεια, Triph. 480–1 and perhaps A.R. 3.1052 κρατεροὺς ζεύξας βόας, Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 958.12 εἰς κρατερὴν δουλοσύνην ἐθεμ[, cf. further Call. fr. 75.6 ὤνοιο κάρθ' ~ 8–9 ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ/γλώσσης.

2.1c. ἀνδρός 'mortal', as usual in epic, see Edwards on *Il.* 18.429–35. ἀνήρ (as θνητός, ἄνθρωπος and the like) commonly comes up in maxims (which, as here, are very often introduced by γάρ, see Campbell on Q.S. 12.388), but the point here may be quite specific, as ἄνδρα is the first word of the *Od.* and had a certain impact as such, see A. Kahane, *TAPA* 122 (1992), 115–31.

2.1d. ἀνάγκη is the power which imposes on someone an unwelcome but inescapable task. It denotes "the compulsion imposed on men in concrete circumstances (as opposed to the 'predestined rigid necessity')", Wil., *Die Griech. Trag.* ii, 26 as cited by Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 218. In Homer it regularly comes up as clausula, cf. also Call. *HyDel.* 35, A.R. 2.18, 232, 3.430 etc.

2.2. ἦ ῥ' οὐδ' ἀθανάτους ὑποδείδιεν As in fr. 5, P. seems to glance at a widespread proverb first attested in Simon. *PMG* 542.29–30 ἀνάγκᾳ/δ' οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται (see Page ad loc., *DGE* s.v. ἀνάγκη II.3). — ὑπο- originally means "unnoticed, secretely" (Schwyzer ii, 524) and ὑποδείδω (on which see Campbell on A.R. 3.318) is often

---

[13] Cf. Σ D *Il.* 1.25 κρατερόν· ἰσχυρόν, ἀπειλητικόν, EtM 532.27, *al.* and *Il.* 16.66–7 κυάνεον Τρώων νέφος ἀμφιβέβηκε/νηυσὶν ἐπικρατέως, [Hes.] *Scut.* 321 (Heracles) πάλλεν ἐπικρατέως his shield, Nic. *Alex.* 72 καί κεν ἐπικρατέουσαν ἀπεχθέα νοῦσον ἀλάλκοις.

used to express the innermost fear of a threatening or superior power, cf. *Il.* 1.406 (Briareus) τὸν καὶ ὑπέδδεισαν μάκαρες θεοί or Jason of Medea in A.R. 4.394, and of the gods, *Od.* 2.66 θεῶν δ' ὑποδείσατε μῆνιν, Q.S. 3.598, 12.488 μακάρων δ' ὑπεδείδιε μῆνιν. The form employed is sanctioned by *Od.* 17.564. For the wording cf. *Od.* 8.224–5 οὔθ' Ἡρακλῆι οὔτ' Εὐρύτῳ Οἰχαλιῆι,/οἵ ῥα καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἐρίζεσκον περὶ τόξων, A.R. 2.820–1 κάπριος ἀργιόδων, . . . ὅν ῥα καὶ αὐταί/Νύμφαι . . ὑπεδείδισαν.

2.3a. ἔκτοσθεν χαλεπῶν ἀχέων ἐκτός, ἔκτοθι, ἔκτοθεν, ἔκτοσθε are always constructed with a concrete noun in Homer, but cf. Hes. *WD* 115 = Theogn. 1121 = *GVI* 1830.4 (3rd cent. AD; the deceased in the Elysian Fields) κακῶν ἔκτοσθεν ἀπάντων/, Orph. *Arg.* 1109 χαλεπῶν ἔκτοσθεν ἀπάντων, further A.R. 1.1037 ἀδευκέος ἔκτοσθεν ἄτης, Opp. *Hal.* 3.606 πόνου ἔκτοσθε, Dioscurus *GDRK* 42.7.19 ἐκτὸς ἀνάγκης, with the meaning 'free from', see Schwyzer ii, 538–9. — χαλεπῶν ἀχέων is novel, perhaps modelled on χαλεπὸν . . . ἄλγος (*Od.* 2.194, Theogn. 555, *GVI* 768.7–8 (2nd cent. BC)), cf. also Emped. 31 B 145.2 D-K δειλαίων ἀχέων. On its range of meanings see F-G on *Od.* 21.412, F. Mawet, *Recherches sur les oppositions fonctionelles dans le vocabulaire homérique de la douleur*, Brussels 1979, 293–349, further literature in Campbell on A.R. 3.446.

2.3b. οἴκους ἐκάμοντο is an unusual expression against the traditional *Il.* 2.750 οἰκί' ἔθεντο/~ *HHAp.* 46 = 137, Dion. Per. 648, *Il.* 12.167–8 μέλισσαι/οἰκία ποιήσωνται ~ *HHAp.* 77, *Od.* 6.9 ἐδείματο οἴκους. The transitive ἐκάμοντο is Homeric, *Od.* 9.130 οἵ κέ σφιν καὶ νῆσον ἐυκτιμένην ἐκάμοντο/, and after P., A.R. 1.1322 περικλεὲς ἄστυ καμόντα/, 2.718 ἱρὸν . . ὅ ῥ' ἐκάμοντο/, Q.S. 12.37 (ἵππον) τόν ῥ' ἐκάμοντο/. For the dwelling place of the gods, epic normally uses neutral phrases such as ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίουσι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσι etc., see W. M. Sale, "Homeric Olympus and its formulae", *AJPh* 105 (1984), 1–7. The poet of the *Il.* credited Hephaestus with the construction of the Olympian residences (Kirk on *Il.* 1.605–8, West on Hes. *Theog.* 43). — Call. would have disliked a hexameter with word-break after the princeps in both the fourth and the fifth foot.

Fr. 3

This fragment is part of Odysseus' narration to Aeolus. It reveals, as Kuiper 147 noted, that P. "non modo interpretatus est in Mercurio

suo sed mutavit quoque" the Homeric sequence of Odysseus' travels. Kuiper drew attention to Lyc. 648–819, the so-called 'Odyssey' of the *Alexandra*,[14] where the poet places the Aeolus episode after Sirens, i.e. including Cyclops, Laestrygones, Scylla and Charybdis, Circe and the Underworld. Lyc. returns to the orthodox Homeric sequence after the Aeolus episode (711f.). It is possible that P. draws on the same source as Lyc., since Timaeus of Tauromenion, an authority on the Greek West whom Lyc. follows here and one whom P. seems to follow in fr. 22, may have treated Odysseus' wanderings in Italy.[15] It is not known whether he presented them in an altered order, but if he followed a geographical order from North to South (cf. τὴν Τυρρηνῶν καὶ τὴν Σικελῶν θάλασσαν in Parth., fr. 1.1), the Aeolian islands would be likely to be mentioned last. To the Odyssean stops, Lyc. adds others at Pithicousai, Bais, Cyma and Ossa. "Quae num iam Philetas quoque omnia tetigerit, neque scio neque scire curo" noted Kuiper 148, but Parth. shows that P. kept close to Homeric data and such innovations would go beyond his scope. It would seem that P. took up an altered order of Odysseus' journeys to provide him with material to narrate. Reports of his adventures in an unHomeric order also occur in a disputed passage in Eur. *Tro.* 433–43 (descent to Hades mentioned last), in Prop. 3.12.24–36 (see Fedeli ad loc.) and Dictys Cret. 6.5. In such lists the original sequence seems to matter little, even less when other purposes can be served better without complete faithfulness to Homer.

This fragment reveals an important aspect of Odysseus' account of his adventures: exaggeration aiming at raising his prestige. The proud οὔ πώ τις is indicative. Homeric Odysseus knows he is not the first to have descended to Hades: even if he ignores Theseus, whom he saw in *Od.* 11.631, Heracles tells him of his own journey to Hades in *Od.* 11.601f. For the Philitan Odysseus his claim to be

---

[14] See on this St. Jocifoviç, *RE Suppl.* XI.895–7, Hutchinson 261–4, V. G. Lanzara, "Il νόστος di Odisseo e la prospezione della memoria", *Maia* 49 (1997), 43–68, G. Schade, *Lycophronis Odusseia*, N.Y.-Berlin 1999. On the structure of Odysseus' adventures see G. A. Privitera, "Ordine e forma dei viaggi di Odysseo" in *Σπονδές στον Όμηρο. Πρακτικά στ' Συνεδρίου για την Οδύσσεια*, Ithace 1993, 57–74.

[15] Cf. Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 164(7.7) (Aeolus established himself in Lipara) ὁ δ' Αἰόλος οὗτός ἐστι, πρὸς ὃν μυθολογοῦσι τὸν Ὀδυσσέα κατὰ τὴν πλάνην ἀφικέσθαι. Timaeus' influence was considerable. Lyc. drew on him on Odysseus' adventures, see E. D. Phillips, *JHS* 73 (1953), 58f.

the first to accomplish such a deed is a conscious lie. Such a boastful air may have been a feature of his postHomeric narrations, cf. Soph. fr. 861 Σειρῆνας εἰσαφικόμην, Φόρκου κόρας, θροοῦντε τοὺς Ἅιδου νόμους.

As frr. 2 and 3 seem to relate to it, the descent to Hades is an accomplishment on which Odysseus may have dwelt in his narration (Maass 1895b, 279 n. 1, Cessi 1908, 139). The event might be presented as the most recent of Odysseus' deeds, perhaps the one just before his visit to Aeolus. It could well serve to bring into connection Odysseus and Hermes. Heracles in *Od.* 11.626 mentions Hermes with regard to his own journey into the Underworld. Hermes is often represented in art as guiding heroes in the Underworld (see the list in G. Siebert, *LIMC* V.1, 335) and he commonly escorts Odysseus too.[16] Touchefeu-Meynier 286 concluded that the unHomeric presence of Hermes in such representations of Odysseus "laisse facilement imaginer ce qu'aurait pu être le rôle du dieu dans une pièce de théâtre". Among a number of candidates most likely is the *Psychagogoi* of Aeschylus (frr. 273–8). P. could take advantage of a non Homeric source linking Odysseus' descent to Hades with Hermes.

3.1a. ἀτραπὸν εἰς Ἀΐδαο/ἤνυσα corresponds to *Od.* 10.490–1 ὁδὸν τελέσαι καὶ ἱκέσθαι/εἰς Ἀΐδαο δόμους. ἀνύω 'complete' is often used of long or tiresome journeys (Hoekstra on *Od.* 15.294); reinforced by ὁδίτης it seems ironical, as Odysseus did not cross Acheron to complete his descent to Hades. For the construction with ἀτραπόν, cf. Lyc. 123 νέρθεν θαλάσσης ἀτραποὺς διήνυσεν, Nicod. Her. *FGE* 1.2 (Odysseus) δολιχὴν ἐξανύσας ἀτραπόν, Nonn. *D.* 18.321, Orph. *Arg.* 115, *GVI* 698.6 (m. 2nd cent. BC), 853.4 (2nd cent. AD; the deceased) δύσβατον αἰφνιδίην ἀτραπὸν | ἠνύσατο/, *EG* 781.2 Kaibel (*c.* 276 BC), *SEG* 30.1350.1–2 (1st/2nd cent. AD) ἀνύσαντα . . ./. . . ἀτραπιτὸν βιότου.

3.1b. ἀτραπὸν ἀτραπός is often used of the way to Hades, but the pun on its meaning 'irreversible' did not appeal to professional poets. *GVI* 756.10 (2nd cent. BC *ex.*) κατέδ]υ ἀτραπὸν εἰς Ἀΐδαν/, 2078.1–2 (Thebes, 2nd cent. BC) ἀδίαυλ[ον ⏑ – ⏑/. . . κατ]ιὼν ἀτραπὸν εἰς Ἀΐδα

[16] See N-H on Hor. *C.* 1.10.17, H. Herter, *RhM* n.s. 119 (1976), 217–8 with n. 92. On his escorting Odysseus see Touchefeu-Meynier 334 (*Index Rerum Nominumque* s.v. Hermès), esp. pp. 135–6, 138–9, *id. LIMC* VI.1, 961 and Brommer 80–3. For later treatments of the Hades-journey of Odysseus see Roscher iii, 626.

and 1249.15–7 (Crete, 2nd/1st cent. BC) οὐ γὰρ μόρσιμόν ἐστι φυγε[ῖν . . ./εἴ γε θεοὶ ταύτην ἀτραπὸν ἡρ[ϊκούς]/καὶ πολὺ βελτείους . . . [ἔβησαν] are possible inscriptional examples. For the application cf. Leon. Tar. *HE* 79.1–2 τὴν ἐπ' Ἄιδος/ἀταρπὸν ἕρπων, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 38.6, Anon. *GDRK* 63.26 (quoted in n. 2a), *GVI* 646.2 (2nd cent. BC), 853.4 (quoted in n. 1a), 985.2 (2nd cent. AD), 1179.8 (2nd cent. BC), 1268.7 (1st cent. AD), 1561.5 (3rd cent. AD), 1479.2 (2nd cent. AD), 1508.16 (*c.* 201 BC) ἵκεο τὴν κοινὴν ἀτραπὸν εἰς Ἀίδεω/, 1552.1 (2nd/1st cent. BC), *AVI* 84.2 (3rd cent. AD). The relevant Homeric passage (*Od.* 10.488–574) insists on ὁδός 'itinerary' (*Od.* 10.490, 501, 563, εὐρώεντα κέλευθα in *Od.* 24.10). — This whole fragment is founded on an etymological pun on ἀτραπός. In antiquity the word was understood either as meaning ὁδὸς εὐθεῖα μὴ ἔχουσα ἐκτροπάς, Apoll. Soph. 46.6 > Hsch. α 8138, Σ A[a] (ex.) *Il.* 17.743 (IV.429 Erbse) ὁδόν, ἣν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκτραπῆναι, also Arist. *HA* 622b25 (ants) ἀεὶ μίαν ἀτραπὸν πάντες βαδίζουσι, Nic. *Ther.* 478 σκολιήν τε καὶ οὐ μίαν ἀτραπὸν ἴλλων, Theodot. *SH* 757.6, or, as here, as meaning 'irreversible' following an etymology from α- privativum + τρέπω 'change direction, turn back', cf. Σ D *Il.* 17.743 ἀταρπόν· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄτροπον ὁδόν and Plato *Phd.* 66b κινδυνεύει τοι ὥσπερ ἀτραπός τις ἐκφέρειν ἡμᾶς μετὰ τοῦ λόγου.

3.1c. ἀτραπὸν εἰς Ἀίδαο The way to Hades was traditionally regarded as irreversible, see Gow on Theoc. 12.19, G-P on Anon. *HE* 48.6. Add Hes. *Theog.* 769–73, Anacr. *PMG* 395.11–2 καὶ γὰρ ἑτοῖμον/καταβάντι μὴ ἀναβῆναι, Plato *Phd.* 113e εἰς τὸν Τάρταρον, ὅθεν οὔποτε ἐκβαίνουσιν, Lyc. 833, Adesp. *TrGF* 658.17 with Kannicht ad loc., *IMEG* 33.23 (2nd cent. BC; οἰκία . . νεκύων) ἀνεπίστροφα πρὸς φάος ἠοῦς, *GVI* 868.3, 1905.23, 1989.9f., 1928.8, 1994a.15f., 2078 (quoted in n. 1b), *AVI* 95.1 (1st cent. BC/1st cent. AD), *SEG* 40.563.9–10 (*c.* 150–50 BC) νεόνυμφον . . . τὰν ἀδίαυλος/. . Ἀίδας ἅρπασεν, Aristides *GDRK* S 2.2.2–3 ἀστραφέεσσι πύλῃσιν . . ./Ἀίδεω, Anon. *GDRK* 53.5, Opp. *Hal.* 4.108 ἀνοστήτοιο λόχοιο, Nonn. *D.* 30.159, 35.65, *Par. Jo.* 2.22, 5.25, 20.9, Cat. 3.12 (Lesbia's sparrow), Virg. *A.* 6.128–9, 425 *ripam inremeabilis undae.*

3.1d. εἰς Ἀίδαο MSS *MA* have εἰς ἄδεω; Meineke 350 correctly held εἰς Ἀίδαο in two of the codd. Parisini as a "manifesta interpolatio", but proposed ἀτραπὸν Ἀίδεω (pent.). εἰς Ἀίδαο is where the dead go in Homer, see Allen on Mimn. (his) fr. 2.14. On the scansion of Ἀίδης see V. Schmidt, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas*,

Berlin-N.Y. 1968, 1–9, C. J. Ruigh, *Lingua* 25 (1970), 306–7, McLennan on Call. *HyJov.* 62.

3.2a. ἀτραπὸν . . ./ ἤνυσα, τὴν οὔπω τις ἐναντίον ἦλθεν Cf. the πολύστιχος in *Il.* 4.334–5 ἕστασαν, ὁππότε κέν τις ἐναντίον ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν/Τρώων, Leon. Tar. *HE* 74.5–6 (Hades) ἦ γὰρ τὴν οὔπω πρὶν ἰτὴν ὁδὸν ἐτμήξαντο/ἄνθρωποι, Anon. *GDRK* 63.26–7 (Hades) λοξὴν δ' ἀτραποῦ τρίβον ἐρπύσας/τόπον ἦλθε τὸν οὔ [τ]ι[ς <ἀφίκετο> (suppl. Grenfell-Hunt), [Opp.] *Cyn.* 1.20–1 τρηχεῖαν ἐπιστείβωμεν ἀταρπόν/τὴν μερόπων οὔ πώ τις ἑῇς ἐπάτησεν ἀοιδαῖς (< Call. fr. 1.25f., see A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 102 (1994), 157 with n. 24).

3.2b. τὴν οὔ πώ τις Cf. *Od.* *10.502 εἰς Ἄιδος δ' οὔ πώ τις ἀφίκετο νηὶ μελαίνῃ, then e.g. *Il.* *24.505 (Priam to Achilleus) ἔτλην δ' οἷ' οὔ πώ τις ἐπιχθόνιος βροτὸς ἄλλος/. This is strong wording; πω discounts any possibility that such thing has happened in the past, cf. e.g. Call. *HyArt.* 244, A.R. 4.261–2. Odysseus is very often said to have achieved what οὔ πώ τις accomplished before him, *Od. l.c.*, 12.186–7 (Sirens), 19.350 (wisdom), 19.365 (piety), 19.380, 24.267. Call. fr. 384.29 applies it to Sosibius, Theoc. 17.38 to Ptolemy's love for Berenice and A.R. 3.919 to the insuperable beauty of Jason.

3.2c. ἐναντίον ἦλθεν Cf. *Il.* *6.394 ἐναντίη ἦλθε (= 15.88, with Janko ad loc.) ~ *Od.* 13.226, *Il.* 17.257 ἀντίος ἦλθε or *Il.* 15.454 (~ 6.251 ~ *Od.* 14.278) ἐναντίος ἤλυθε – x/, further Arat. 102 /ἤρχετο δ' ἀνθρώπων κατεναντίη. Comparable is Hes. *Theog.* 658–60 ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος/ἄψορρον . . ./ἠλύθομεν. For ἀτραπὸν ἔρχομαι cf. Opp. *Hal.* 3.504 ἦλθον ἀτραπόν.

3.2d. ὁδίτης is clausular, as usual in Homer and later. Here it is intrinsically equivalent to 'mortal'. The word is significant, as it is the vehicle for an allusion to Odysseus' incomplete journey to Hades. Odysseus did not cross Acheron but stood at its shore and performed a necromancy. For a proper descent it is not enough to 'walk' (ὁδίτης), but to 'sail' to Hades.[17] Theoc. 16.52–3 (Odysseus) Ἀίδαν τ' εἰς ἔσχα-

---

[17] Cf. the instructions of Circe in *Od.* 10.490–1, 10.511f. In *Od.* 12.21 Circe takes Odysseus' proper descent to Hades as granted. For sailing to Hades, cf. Ar. *Ran.* 136–7, Hermesian. *CA* 7.3, Theoc. 1.140 (with A. M. van Erp Taalman Kip, *Hermes* 115 (1987), 249–51), 17.47–9, Leon. Tar. *HE* 10.1, 59.1–2, A.R. 3.61 with Campbell ad loc., *GVI* 1883.10 (2nd cent. BC), Meleag. *HE* 60, Antiph. *GPh* 28, Etruscus *GPh* 1, Anon. Hymn *GDRK* 53.5.

τον ἐλθών/ζωός might also play on this. On the form and usages of the word see Redard 32.

Fr. 4

Bach 37–8 first assigned this fragment to *Hermes*. Stob. cod. *S* has τοῦ αὐτοῦ (a fragment of P.'s *Demeter* precedes, see R. M. Piccione, *RFIC* 127 (1999), 149f.). Bach's assignation has good reason: a soliloquy of Odysseus in the presence of Aeolus, in which the hero deplores his misfortunes, fits both the personality and the aims of Odysseus. The invocation of *thymos* is peculiar. In the *Od.* the hero soliloquises when he is all alone and the soliloquy is introduced by the poet. Those are monologues in moments of genuine despair.[18] But here Odysseus probably soliloquises before Aeolus (and the Aeolids) and the soliloquiser coincides with the narrator. This appears to be part of Odysseus' strategy to win the sympathy and help of Aeolus. To achieve this he takes advantage of his fame as the πολύτλας hero (cf. *Od.* 1.11f., 4.106–7). Odysseus, in highly emotional tones, would present himself as a man who deserves to be pitied. The practice is known e.g. from *Od.* 6.169f. with Odysseus pleading Nausicaa in a similar spirit, from *Od.* 7.24–6 pleading Athena or from *Od.* 18.51–8, where Odysseus preparing to fight Irus pretents to be an old and weak man so as to secure the neutrality of the suitors, see Stanford 14–7.

The most notable feature of this fragment, however, is its highly cryptic language. The superficial imagery is that of the sea, all keywords (πεφύρησαι, χαλεποῖσι, θυμέ, γαληναίῃ, ἐπιμίσγεαι, ἀνῖαι, τετρήχασιν) can be read with their innocent Homeric sense as well as their allusive post-Homeric meaning. πεφύρησαι provokes the image of someone striving to save his life among waves and γαληναίη viz. γαλήνη is the *vox propria* for 'calm' in the sea. Still, the erotic innuendos are there as a kind of dramatic irony. The grounds for the address to θυμός are equivocal. ἀνῖαι superficially refers to one more of Odysseus' many misfortunes, but the word carries its long established erotic nuance. This is reinforced by the strongly ambiguous ἐπιμίσγομαι. τετρήχασι can cover both semantic fields, but besides ἀνῖαι

[18] Cf. Jason's monologue in A.R. 4.1331f. See R. L. Fowler, "The Rhetoric of Desperation", *HSCP* 91 (1987), 20–3.

the erotic sense prevails. χαλεποῖσι equally well applies to sea and love.[19] The tranquillity of the soul denoted by γαληναίη could be granted by abstention from erotic adventures (normally ἡσυχία, but cf. Palladas *AP* 10.56.16). The unusual construction with ἐπιμίσγομαι intensifies this innuendo. It would seem that Odysseus deplores his erotic adventures under a seafaring pretext, as e.g. Polyxo's speech to the Lemnian women in A.R. 1.675f. abounds in sexual allusions under an agricultural pretext. Sea-images (mostly storms) are commonly used as love images, cf. Asclep. (or Posid.) *HE* 36.5 with G-P ad loc., Anon. *HE* 22 and Meleag. *HE* 25, 64, 114.7–8, *al.*

The fragment seems to belong to a later part of Odysseus' narration: his self-pity about repeated seafaring misfortunes should mean that he has already narrated most of them, perhaps all, up to his arrival at Aeolus' island. Following this, the hero would go on to request help. The erotic allusions would hint at Polymele's growing passion for the stranger and would foreshadow the evolution of the episode.

4.1a. ἦ μὲν δή is used in emphatic affirmations and is almost always confined to speeches (always in Homer), as it expresses a subjective certainty, see Denniston 389, Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 91 *cl. Il.* 19.109 (oath), *Od.* 2.272, 4.33, 19.235, Call. *HyDel.* 2–3, A.R. 1.631, 3.954, *al.* It normally comes up next to a quantitative statement and often confirms a disagreeable reality or, as here, endurance in grief, cf. *Il.* 2.798 ἦ μὲν δὴ μάλα πολλὰ μάχας εἰσήλυθον ἀνδρῶν, 9.348, 464, 17.538–9, 18.12, Archil. *IEG* 188.4–5 ἦ γὰρ πολλὰ δή σ' ἐπῆιξεν/ πνεύμ]ατα χειμερίων ἀνέμων, A.R. 1.807 ἦ μὲν δηρὸν ἐτέτλαμεν, 4.901, Rhian. *CA* 1.1–2 ἦ ἄρα δὴ μάλα πάντες ἁμαρτίνοοι πελόμεσθα/ ἄνθρωποι, and perhaps Euph. *CA* 50.1. The affirmation of a fact is often, as here, accompanied with a vocative of compassion or wonder, cf. *Il.* 24.518 ἆ δείλ', ἦ δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἄνσχεο σὸν κατὰ θυμόν, *Od.* 9.507, Semon. *IEG* 22 <ἦ> (suppl. Bergk) πολλὰ μὲν δὴ προυκπονέαι Τηλέμβροτε, A.R. 1.1337 ὦ πέπον, ἦ μάλα δή με κακῷ ἐκυδάσσαο μύθῳ, 4.1673, 4.1749, *GVI* 1502.1–2 (3rd cent. BC *in.*), 2017.1 (bef. 229 BC) ἦ μάλα δὴ περὶ σεῖο λυγρὸμ πότμον ἔκλυε πάτρα, see

[19] Cf. *Od.* 10.464 χαλεπῆς ἄλης, Arat. 110 χαλεπὴ . . . θάλασσα along with Sappho fr. 1.25–6 χαλέπαν δὲ λῦσον/ἐκ μερίμναν, Asclep. *HE* 16.2 χαλεπὴ Κύπρις, Theoc. 2.95, 29.22, 40 χαλέπω πόθω, 30.1, 17, 23, Call. fr. 75.49, *HE* 3, Anon. *HE* 31.1, Imperial elegy POxy. 3723.ii.22 (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 7.22), Anon. *GDRK* 39.15 θηλυτέρης δὲ νόος χαλεπώτερός ἐστ[ι θ]αλάσ[σης.

for ἦ μάλα δή, much affected in the 3rd cent. BC to assert funerary grief, *AVI*, 85. Such strong asseverations are sometimes used to reinforce false statements, cf. Odysseus in *Od.* 14.216, Jason in A.R. 4.96–7. On exclamations after asseverative expressions see Vian on A.R. 4.59.

4.1b. πολέεσσι πεφύρησαι χαλεποῖσι,/θυμέ Cf. Archil. *IEG* 128.1 θυμέ, θύμ', ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε in a fragment dealing with the ability of man to endure unavoidable misfortunes (see S. D. Sullivan, *SIFC* 87 (1994), 14–6), *Od.* 20.18 τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη etc. The diction is formed in combination with Homeric underpinnings such as *Od.* 8.137 κακοῖσι συνέρρηκται πολέεσσιν/, *Od.* 18.123 = 20.200 κακοῖς ἔχεαι πολέεσσι, all of Odysseus, cf. also Hes. *WD* 119 σὺν ἐσθλοῖσιν πολέεσσιν/, Q.S. 14.290 πολέεσσι περιπλήθουσα κακοῖσιν ~ 14.294. To the traditional scheme P. brings about two changes: instead of κακοῖσι he writes χαλεποῖσι, previously unattested as a noun, and transfers πολέεσσι from the end of the verse to the position before the caesura.[20] These two words mutually exchange their usual metrical positions. The line might have influenced A.R. 4.993–4 πολέεσσιν ἐνισχομένη καμάτοισι/Θρινακίης etc. of the troubled and retarded journey of Argo. Kidd on Arat. 297 gathered passages where an alliteration of -π- reinforces the sense of danger, often in the sea, cf. esp. A.R. 1.631.

4.2a. θυμέ θυμός is the centre of the emotions (Bremmer 1983, 54–6, Caswell 40–1) and addresses to it are usual from Homer onwards in all genres of poetry. The effect is an artificial distancing between man and his *thymos*. Odysseus, the most self-conscious epic hero, already in the *Il.* but mostly in the *Od.*, establishes a special relationship with his *thymos*.[21] But within context, Odysseus may have an untraditional rationale for his apostrophe here. Desperate addresses to

---

[20] πολέεσσι occurs 10x in Homer, in nine of which it is placed in the second half of the verse. In expressions of the Philitan kind (4x) it is always clausular as it is in Hes. *WD* 119. It is placed before the caesura only in *Od.* 5.54, then here, Call. fr. 110.61 (the only attestation of the form) cf. also *id.* fr. 358.3 πλεόνεσσι|, always in A.R. (1.273, 2.1027, 1216, 3.900, 4.993), Nic. *Alex.* 242, Epica Adesp. *CA* 4.16 (attributed by Hollis 1990, 29 n. 15 to Rhianus, with whom F. Williams, *CR* n.s. 64 (1994), 17 agrees), *SEG* 42.329.3 (*c.* 200 BC), Q.S. 4 out of 6 occurrences, Claud. *Gig.* 59. The form is not attested in Theoc., Aratus or Nonnus. For χαλεποῖσι as a clausula cf. *Od.* 2.83, *HHAp.* 358.

[21] In critical moments Odysseus turns to his *thymos*, cf. *Il.* 11.403f. in view of the dangers of battle, then *Od.* 5.298, 355, 407, 464, 6.118. In *Il.* 4.494 Odysseus is

θυμός (or ψυχή) befit those suffering through any reason including love, cf. in an erotic context Simon. *IEG* 21.3, Pind. frr. 123.2, 127.4, Meleag. *HE* 19.3, 96.2, *al.*, Imperial elegy POxy. 3723.ii.23 (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 7.23), 'Plato' *FGE* 6.3, Philod. *GPh* 11.3, *Anacreont.* 60.24.

4.2b. γαληναίῃ varies Homeric γαλήνη,[22] γαλάνεια being previously a poeticism in lyrics in tragedy, cf. fr. 12.2 δειλαίων for Homeric δειλῶν. The form recurs in Call. *HE* 52.5 (γαλήνη unattested, but 2x ἀναγκαίη, 1x ἀνάγκη), A.R. 1.1156 (γαλήνη in 4.1249), Arat. 3x (γαλήνη 2x; adj. γαληναῖος first here in 765, where see Kidd), later Apollonid. *GPh* 9.4, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 57.2, Opp. *Hal.* 3x (γαλήνη 2x). Theoc. has only γαλήνη, 2x. Adjj. in -αιος are usually derived from the cognate noun ('having to do with . .'), cf. Herodian Καθολ. Προσῳδ. *apud* H. Hunger, *JÖByz* 16 (1967), 12 (fr. 48), 20 (> Erat. *SH* 398) and see Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 50. These enjoyed some popularity in Hellenistic verse, see Schmitt 40–2 for Call. and in general B-P 44–5, 48f. A.R. 3.324 has ἐρημαίην (as substantive first in 3.1197) after Empedocles (see Livrea on Colluth. 42, Campbell on Q.S. 12.489), Arat. 93 coins ἀμαξαίης, Leon. Tar. *HE* 66.1 has ἐπακταῖος for ἐπάκτιος, *id. HE* 86.6 (hapax) βορειαίης for βορείης and cf. Arat. 813 γαληναίης ~ 814 γαλήνης, 815 σελήνην ~ 818 σεληναίην, the latter being common in Hellenistic verse (2x in A.R., 1x in Call., cf. Theoc. 2.165 with Gow ad loc.).

4.2c. γαληναίῃ δ' ἐπιμίσγεαι Cf. *Il.* 10.548–9 (Nestor to Odysseus) αἰεὶ μὲν Τρώεσσ' ἐπιμίσγομαι, οὐδέ τι φημί/μιμνάζειν παρὰ νηυσί. For the sense cf. *Il.* 13.797 (ἀέλλῃ) ἁλὶ μίσγεται, Pind. *P.* 4.251–2 (Jason) ἔν τ' Ὠκεανοῦ πελάγεσσι μίγεν πόντῳ τ' ἐρυθρῷ/Λαμνιᾶν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν ἀνδροφόνων, Call. *HE* 38.5–6 φεῦγε θαλάσσῃ/συμμίσγειν. Maritime language is commonly employed for psychological suffering, cf. *Il.* 9.4–8 and see Caswell 51–61. — Although μίσγομαι commonly takes an abstract object, ἐπιμίσγομαι always takes a concrete

---

distressed θυμόν for the death of one of his companions and when wounded in *Il.* 11.458 he κῆδε . . θυμόν. In *Il.* 10.232, 244–5 his *thymos* leads him to brave deeds in the battlefield, cf. *Od.* 9.213, 500, 14.219, *al.* Already in the proem of the *Od.* (1.4) the hero suffers in the sea ὃν κατὰ θυμόν. Odysseus often needs to consult his *thymos*, cf. *Od.* 9.295 ἀμηχανίῃ δ' ἔχε θυμόν, 299 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατὰ μεγαλήτορα θυμόν etc., 302 ἕτερος δέ με θυμὸς ἔρυκεν.

[22] In Homer the word occurs 5x only in *Odyssey* and only with the meaning 'calm (in the sea)'. See D. van Nes, *Die maritime Bildersprache des Aischylos*, Göttingen 1963, 65f., J. Péron, *Les images maritimes de Pindar*, Paris 1974, 290–1, *DGE* s.v.

one in Homer, cf., though, Pind. fr. 94.4–5 (Apollo) ἀθανάταν χάριν/ Θήβαις ἐπιμ<ε>ίξων, Opp. *Hal.* 4.214 λύσσῃ . . . ἐπιμίσγεται. For γαληναίῃ cf. *Anacreont.* 17.12–3 μέλαν ὄμμα . . ./κεκερασμένον γαλήνῃ. μίσγομαι is common for sexual intercourse and it is used ambiguously at least once in *Od.* 6.287 (Nausicaa despises a woman who) ἀνδράσι μίσγηται πρίν γ' ἀμφάδιον γάμον ἐλθεῖν.[23] ἐπιμ(ε)ίγνυμι is allusively used in Call. *HyJov.* 11–3 ἔνθεν ὁ χῶρος/ἱερός, οὐδέ τί μιν κεχρημένον Εἰλειθυίης/ἑρπετὸν οὐδὲ γυνὴ ἐπιμίσγεται. In A.R. 3.658–9, where a young bride mourns her husband who died before they experienced the joys of love οὐδέ τί πω πάσαις ἐπιμίσγεται ἀμφιπόλοισιν/αἰδοῖ ἐπιφροσύνῃ τε, the verb "provides a further reinforcement" of "a powerful picture of a sexual urge" of Medea (Campbell 1983, 40 with 110 n. 15). The combined seafaring and sexual nuances of μίσγομαι, despite Braswell ad loc., may find a precedent in Pind. *l.c.* of Jason.

4.2d. οὐδ' ὅσον ὅσσον From colloquial ὅσον ὅσ(σ)ον (e.g. Ar. *V.* 213 τί οὐκ ἀπεκοιμήθημεν ὅσον ὅσον στίλην;) P. constructs his οὐδ' ὅσον ὅσσον 'not even a bit'. Homer has οὐδ' ἠβαιόν (*Il.* 2.380, *al.*), οὐδὲ τυτθόν (*Il.* 1.354), οὐδὲ μίνυνθα (*Il.* 20.27, A.R. 2.230), Arat. 21 οὐδ' ὀλίγον, cf. also colloquial οὐδ' ὄναρ (Eur. fr. 107, Herodas 1.11, Call. (or Rufinus) *HE* 63.4, 5), Herodas 7.33 οὐδ' ὅσον ῥοπήν ψεῦδος and the exquisite Callimachean *HE* 3.9 οὐδ' ὅσον ἀττάραγον. For the double ὅσον cf. Leon. Tar. *HE* 77.3–4 τίς μοῖρα ζωῆς ὑπολείπεται ἢ ὅσον ὅσσον/στιγμή, Paul. Sil. *AP* 5.255.5 ἀμφασίης ὅσον ὅσσον ὑπερπρήυνον ἀνάγκῃ, and for the juxtaposition *Il.* 16.722 ὅσον ἥσσων . . τόσον, Gorgias *Enc. Hel.* 11 ὅσοι δὲ ὅσους περὶ ὅσων, Theoc. 4.39 ὅσον αἶγες ἐμὶν φίλαι, ὅσσον ἀπέσβης, *id.* 12.3–4, Leon. Tar. *HE* 75.5–6 ὅσης ὅσσον/, Bion fr. 10.12–3 ὅσων . . ./ὅσσα, and on different forms of the same word beside one another see N. Hopkinson, *Glotta* 60 (1982), 168–71; for τόσ(σ)ον ὅσ(σ)ον see Ll-J – Parsons on Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 924.8 and cf. the eccentric A.R. 1.468 τόσον ὁσσάτιον (ὅσον . . ./τοσσάτιον in Joann. Gaz. 1.220–1, 2.189–90), Theoc. 1.54 τοσσῆνον ὅσον, 4.55 ὁσσίχον 'how little'. P.'s novel combination οὐδ' ὅσον enjoyed a widespread and lasting career, cf. Asclep.

---

[23] See Hainsworth ad loc. *Od.* 7.246–7 (Circe) οὐδέ τις αὐτῇ/μίσγεται οὔτε θεῶν οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων is another ambiguous case, see D. L. Cairns, *CQ* n.s. 40 (1990), 263–6. On ambiguous μίσγομαι see Garvie on *Od.* 6.136 and cf. (Calypso) ἐφίλει in *Od.* 7.256.

HE 19.2, Call. *HyAp.* 37, A.R. 1.290, 482, *al.*, Theoc. 9.20 with Gow ad loc., Headlam on Herodas 7.33. The final effect of the verse is deliberately wry, as besides the highly poetical γαληναίῃ and ἐπιμίσγομαι lies the humble οὐδ' ὅσον ὅσσον.

4.2e. πεφύρησαι . . / . . . ἐπιμίσγεαι . . . / . . . τετρήχασιν P. might have extensively employed ambivalent 'whirling' terminology in his Odysseus episode, cf. Polymele ἀλινδουμένη in Parth., fr. 1.2. For the present beside perfects here cf. *Il.* 4.11 ἀεὶ παρμέμβλωκε καὶ . . . ἀμύνει, see P. Chantraine, *Histoire du parfait grec*, Paris 1927, 19, Schwyzer ii, 287, and for the present beside past tenses see West on Hes. *Theog.* 7. — Juxtaposed synonyms is another way to exhibit erudition. Arist. *Poet.* fr. 3 Kassel pointed out their usefulness for poets and the Alexandrian scholar Hermonax wrote a work entitled Συνώνυμα, a specimen of which survives in Athen. 11.480f. In P. cf. also fr. 12.1 μελέοιο 2 δειλαίων, fr. 21.1 ἱερόν 2 θεῖον. Some synonyms in Homer are formulaic, see in general Schwyzer ii, 704, but some others seem to have some literary merit, cf. *Il.* 18.478 ποίει 479 βάλλε 482 ποίει 483 ἔτευξ', 22.407–9 κώκυσεν . . . / ᾤμωξεν . . . / κωκυτῷ . . . καὶ οἰμωγῇ, 23.364–5 ἐσσυμένως . . . ὦκα . . . / . . . ταχέως. In Hellenistic poetry cf. Asclep. *HE* 17.4 τέφρην . . . κάνθρακίην, Call. *HyJov.* 20 εὔυδρος 22 ὑγρός 24 διεροῦ, *ibid.* 71 ἐμπεράμους 74 ἴδρις 78 εὖ εἰδότας, *HyAp.* 22 πέτρος 23 λίθος 24 μάρμαρον, *ibid.* 57 θεμείλια . . ὑφαίνει 58 θεμείλια . . ἔπηξε (61 ἔπλεκε βωμόν) 64 θεμείλια . . ἐγείρειν, *HyArt.* 9 τόξον 10 ἄεμμα, *ibid.* 238 βρέτας 240 πρύλιν, *ibid.* 86 δαίμων 119 θεή 137 ἄνασσα (see P. Bing – V. Uhrmeister, *JHS* 114 (1994), 23–5), *HE* 38.3 ἐν ὑγρῇ 5 θαλάσσῃ, *ibid.* 2.1 ἐχθαίρω 3 μισέω 4 σικχαίνω (in a crescendo disposition), fr. 75.12 κακὸς χλόος . . νοῦσος 17 πυρί 19 ὀλοὸς κρυμός (in Call. see further Lapp 116f., Bornmann xlviii–li), A.R. 1.1021 ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν 1023 νημερτὲς ἐπήϊσαν, 1.1274–76 ὦκα δὲ Τῖφυς/εἰσβαίνειν ὀρόθυνεν . . . /οἱ δ' εἴσβαινον ἄφαρ, 2.265 ξιφέεσσιν 274 φάσγαν(α) 288 ξιφέεσσιν, 2.818 εἰαμενῇ 819 ἰλύι 822 τίφος, 2.1034 ὄρνιν 1044 οἰωνόν, 3.45 κόμας 47 πλοκάμους 50 χαίτας, 3.148 αἶψα . . αὐτοσχεδόν, 3.223 ἀναβλύεσκε 224 νᾶεν 225 προρέεσκε 227 ἀνεκήκιε, 3.247 ἀμφίπολοι 254 δμῳαί, 3.360 ἔσαν . . υἷες 361 ἔην πάις 363 γόνον ἔμμεναι, 3.378 ταμὼν . . . κεάσσας, 3.863–4 λυγαίῃ ἐνὶ νυκτὶ σὺν ὀρφναίοις φαρέεσσι·/. . . ἐρεμνὴ σείετο γαῖα, 3.967 = 4.693 ἄνεω καὶ ἄναυδοι, 4.1295 from *Il.* 19.346 ἄκμηνοι καὶ ἄπαστοι, Theoc. 1.27 κισσύβιον 55 δέπας 143 σκῦφος, 1.71 λύκοι ὠρύσαντο 72 λέων ἔκλαυσε 75 πόρτιες ὠδύραντο, 11.23–4

οἴχῃ . . . ἀνῇ . ./φεύγεις, Euph. *CA* 34.1 φωνηθείσης 2 κικλήσκεσθαι 3 αὐδηθῆναι, Simias *Ov.* 11 (Hermes) θοῶς . . . ὠκὺ . . φέρων νεῦμα ποδῶν 13 θοαῖς ἴσ' αἰόλαις νεβροῖς κῶλ' ἀλάσσων 15 κραιπνοῖς . . . ποσί 20 θοοῖσι<ν> . . ποσίν, [Mosch.] *Megara* 94 ἔχων μακέλην 101 λίστρον . . . ἐρείσας 108 νώμασκεν μακέλην, the Salmakis-epigram (2nd cent. BC), which in twelve lines employs ten different ways for 'gave birth' (C. Austin, *ZPE* 126 (1999), 92, M. Gigante, *A&R* n.s. 44 (1999), 3–4), then Archias *GPh* 24.2 νεφέλης, 4 λίνων, 6 πάγαι, Nonn. *D.* 1.16–33 with four different names for Dionysus and five synonyms for 'sing', *D.* 1.128–9 εἴπατε ταύρῳ,/εἰ βόες εἰσαΐουσιν, 37.443 φίλος δ' ἐρίδαινεν ἑταίρῳ.

4.3a. ἀμφὶ δέ τοι νέαι αἰὲν ἀνῖαι τετρήχασιν is echoed in A.R. 4.447 in an invocation to Eros (ἐκ σέθεν) ἄλγεά τ' ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ἀπείρονα τετρήχασι/, cf. also *id.* 4.351–2 (Medea) δή ῥά μιν ὀξεῖαι κραδίην ἐλέλιξαν ἀνῖαι/νωλεμές,[24] Euph. *SH* 415.i.20 τάδ' ἀμφί σ[ε τ]ετρήχο̣ι̣ε̣ν̣/ (Rengakos 1994, 146 n. 674), further Arat. 276 τὰ δέ οἱ ἔπι τετρήχυνται/. Its relation to Mimn. *IEG* 1.7 αἰεί μιν φρένας ἀμφὶ κακαὶ τείρουσι μέριμναι is not necessarily close. The line contains some remarkable rhetorical figures. There is a kind of anagrammatisation νέαι: αἰέν[25] and a resounding wailing effect produced by a heavy spondaic ending with contracted fourth and fifth biceps and an -αι- alliteration, as strong as e.g. Call. *HE* 59.2 τὰν ἀμὰν οὐκ ἐμάνη μανίαν. Demetr. *De eloc.* 69 particularly approved of names such as Αἰακός and Αἰαίη. This sound was regarded as the most appropriate for depicting a mourning context. αἰαῖ, αἰάζω are unknown

---

[24] Echoing *HHD* 40 ὀξὺ δέ μιν κραδίην ἄχος ἔλλαβεν, but cf. ἐλέλιξαν ~ πεφύρησαι, ἀνῖαι, νωλεμές ~ αἰὲν τετρήχασιν. A.R. may echo the fragment more than once, see also n. 1b *ad fin.*

[25] The phenomenon is almost non-existent in Homer, cf. though *Od.* 2.58–9 ἀνήρ,/. . . ἀρὴν ἀπὸ οἴκου ἀμῦναι and the surely unintentional *Il.* 5.160, *al.* /εἰν ἐνί etc. The ancients tried to detect some anagrams in Homer such as *Il.* 21.6 ἠέρα δ' Ἥρη, cf. Plato *Crat.* 404b-c and see Campbell on A.R. 3.211. Aristotle held anagrams as a kind of παρομοίωσις and approved of them, *Rhet.* 1410a25f. Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 45–6 (I.74 van der Valk) quotes some late examples. Tzetzes (Σ Lyc. 5.4 Scheer = Lyc. *SH* 531) says that Lycophron won fame in the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus mainly because of his anagrams, but the credibility of this information is contested. There is a well known case in Virg. *A.* 8.322–3 Latium*que vocari/*maluit, *his quoniam* latui*sset in oris*, see F. Ahl, *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*, Ithaca 1985, 47–8, A. Cameron, "Greek Anagrams", *AJPh* 116 (1995), 477–84, J. Korpanty, "Syllabische Homophonie in Lateinischer Dichtung und Prosa", *Hermes* 125 (1997), 330f.

to Homer, but cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 922–30 (*al.*) γᾶ δ' αἰάζει τὰν ἐγγαίαν/ ἥβαν [. . .] ἐξέφθινται./αἰαῖ <αἰαῖ> κεδνᾶς ἀλκᾶς·/'Ασία δὲ χθών, βασιλεῦ γαίας,/αἰνῶς αἰνῶς ἐπὶ γόνυ κέκλιται, the usually double αἴλινον (Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 171a-3), Achaeus *TrGF* 20 F 28 βαβαὶ βαβαὶ, βήσομαι γυναῖκας, then Hermesian. *CA* 7.43–4 (Antim.) ὑπὸ ξηρὴν θέτο γαῖαν/κλαίων, αἰάζων δ' ἦλθεν etc. (Ilgen: καλλίων αἴζαον διηλθεν Athen. *A*), Theoc. 2.55 αἰαῖ Ἔρως ἀνιαρέ, Mnasalc. *HE* 10.1–2 αἰαῖ παρθενίας ὀλοόφρονος ἅς ἄπο φαιδράν/ἔκλασας ἁλικίαν, [Mosch.] *Megara* 27–8, Bion *EA* 56–7 ἔχω δ' ἀκόρεστον ἀνίαν/καὶ κλαίω τὸν Ἄδωνιν, *passim*, cf. the accumulation of initial αι- in vv. 88–95 (all but 92) and the fact that that poem begins and ends with the syllable -αι-, Parth. *SH* 646.2–3, Nonn. *D.* 5.354–5, funerary epigrams beginning with αἰ- such as a 5th cent. BC epitaph *apud* J. Ebert, *ZPE* 112 (1996), 66, *CEG* 556, 686 (both 4th cent. BC), Arat. *HE* 2.1, Greg. Naz. *AP* 8.120 and -αι- tails such as Asclep. *HE* 31.1–2 παρὰ τῷδε κάθημαι/Αἴαντος τύμβῳ, Call. *HyAp.* 20 Θέτις Ἀχιλῆα κινύρεται αἴλινα μήτηρ, A.R. 4.604–5 Ἡλιάδες . . †ἀείμεναι† αἰγείροισι/μύρονται, 4.1339–40 ὠρύεται· αἱ δὲ . . /. . ὑποβρομέουσι . . . βῆσσαι, Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1031 ὀλοφυρομένης . . . εἴβεται αἰών, Q.S. 7.331 μύρεται αἰόλα τέκνα.

4.3b. αἰέν Cf. *Od.* 11.482 (Odysseus) ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἔχω κακά. αἰέν is typical in complaints, cf. e.g. A.R. 2.631, 3.94 and see W. Marg, *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Darmstadt ^{2}1967, 52–3, Macleod on *Il.* 24.62. In P. cf. also fr. 9.1 νῦν δ' αἰεὶ πέσσω, fr. 10.3–4 (κακά) μένουσιν/ἔμπεδ' ἀεί.

4.3c. ἀνῖαι As γαληναίῃ, ἀνῖαι is an exclusively Odyssean word, which is almost always connected with Odysseus. The term describes the weariness caused by a protracted or enforced activity which does not lead to the desired conclusion, whether this is a hospitality as in *Od.* 7.192, or fighting as in *Od.* 2.291 (see Campbell on Q.S. 12.376). In this sense ἀνία has a long tradition in an amatory context of unattained love beginning with Sappho fr. 1.3–4 μή μ' ἄσαισι μηδ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα/. . θῦμον, and appears in poets associated with P., cf. Asclep. *HE* 17.5, 19.3, 42.4, Posid. *HE* 6.4, Theoc. 29.9, Hermesian. *CA* 7.92, Anon. *HE* 31.1, Meleag. *HE* 107.3. In Call. *HE* 13.1–2 a man in love snorts ἀνιηρόν/πνεῦμα, in Theoc. 2.39 enamoured Simaetha concedes Δέλφις ἔμ' ἀνίασεν and in 11.71 Cyclops in love ἀνιᾶται. In A.R. 3.290 (Eros to Medea) γλυκερῇ . . κατείβετο θυμὸν ἀνίῃ and in 3.1066–67 Medea addresses Jason

ἀνιηρῷ . . ./. . μύθῳ, cf. also 3.765–6, 777, 1103. Hellenistic poets, in this word and its derivatives, almost always scan -ι- as long, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 263.2.

4.3d. τετρήχασιν τέτρηχα is the Homeric perfect of θράσσω, a cognate of ταράσσω, revived by P. and afterwards frequently used in Hellenistic poetry. In Homer it occurs in *Il.* 2.95, 7.346, both of assemblies in turmoil, but the imagery is clearly one of the sea, cf. *Od.* 5.291 ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον, Archil. *IEG* 105.1–2, Pind. *O.* 2.69 and *Il.* 2.144 κινήθη δ' ἀγορὴ φὴ κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης. It is very often used of the sea itself, cf. Leon. Tar. *HE* 63.1 τετρηχυῖα θάλασσα, A.R. 1.1167 τετρηχότος οἴδματος, Euph. *SH* 415.ii.20, Nic. *Ther.* 267, Opp. *Hal.* 5.244, but also of the torments of love, as A.R. 4.447 (quoted in n. 3a), 3.275–6 Ἔρως . . . ἷξεν ἄφαντος,/τετρηχώς, ταράσσω being previously used of love in e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 969 ὅταν ταράξῃ Κύπρις ἡβῶσαν φρένα. In certain passages a connection with τρηχύς is probable, cf. Asclep. *HE* 30.1 τρηχεῖα θάλασσα, A.R. 2.70–1 κῦμα θαλάσσης/τρηχύ, 1.613 τρηχὺν ἔρον and see H. Erbse, *Hermes* 81 (1953), 173–4 (criticised by Rengakos 1993, 145–6), Livrea on A.R. 4.447. "Such colouring does not rule out a more fundamental association with ταραχή", Campbell on A.R. 3.276, which in view of κυκώμενε and ἐπιμίσγεαι looks certain here. Campbell also noted that the association of a sea-verb with Eros is natural through Eros' sea-born mother, cf. Asclep. (or Posid.) *HE* 36.

Fr. 5

This fragment survives due to the peculiar form αἰδώ. The reference to Theoc. as a pupil of P. suggests that Herodian draws here on a lost Σ on Theoc. (von Blumenthal 2170) ultimately going back to Theon. The reference could find a place in Herodian's discussion on the accentuation of the Homeric αἶδω, cf. Σ *Il.* 2.262b (I.239 Erbse). The fragment was attributed to *Hermes* by Powell, who linked it with fr. 2 because of its gnomic character. It would seem possible that when Aeolus found out about the secret affair of his daughter and his former guest, he used this maxim in his traditionally angry reaction (see fr. 1.3c). The content of the proverb fits the circumstances: Polymele, during Odysseus' sojourn, would have taken her usual innocent stand ἐν ὄμμασι but not ἐν ἤθεσι, as she κρύφα συνῆν with the stranger. Other indications point towards *Hermes* as well. αἰδώς in Homer is employed in all occurrences but one (*Il.*

15.657) in direct speech. As Arist. *EN* 1128b15 noted, οὐ πάσῃ δ' ἡλικίᾳ τὸ πάθος ἁρμόζει, ἀλλὰ τῇ νέᾳ. When the term applies to moral issues, it mostly refers to women (Cairns 1993, 120–5, 185–8, 305–40) and it is particularly apt of young maidens: κοῦραι should display αἰδώς in their dealings with men, cf. *Il.* 2.514 παρθένος αἰδοίη, A.R. 3.681–2 αἰδώς/παρθενίη, see Campbell on Q.S. 12.555. *aidos* is also to be exhibited towards the members of a family, cf. Plato *Rep.* 463d, Arist. *Pol.* 1335a2 and see Brasswell on Pind. *P.* 4.146. Nevertheless, *aidos* towards the parents may be abandoned, if not openly, for the love of a man. In Pind. *P.* 4.218 Aphrodite instructs Jason ὄφρα Μηδείας τοκέων ἀφέλοιτ' αἰδῶ, cf. also Callirhoe in Chariton 1.1.8 αἰδουμένη κατάφωρος γενέσθαι that she loves Chaereas. In [Theoc.] 27.69–70 a young girl after making love to Daphnis πάλιν ἔστιχε μᾶλα νομεύειν/ὄμμασιν αἰδόμενοις, κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ἰάνθη.

The fragment reminds of Hesiodic proverbial expressions of the type *WD* 369 δειλὴ δ' ἐν πυθμένι φειδώ/, see on these L. Sbardella in Fantuzzi-Pretagostini i, 121f., esp. 127f. The mode of expression on an occasion of wrath is noteworthy: the fragment varies the proverb αἰδὼς ἐν ὄμμασι (see n. b). Hellenistic poets freely use proverbs or variations of proverbs to produce a light, even grotesque effect.[26] Interest in proverbs originates in Aristotle and Theophrastus and may indicate Peripatetic influence. *Dictio levior* in passages of high tension is commonly employed by the erudite poets to wittily defuse the tenseness of a situation. Call. *Hec.* fr. 7 ἴσχε τέκος, μὴ πῖθι employs comic πῖθι in a moment of high tension. Angry characters in particular often make fun of themselves. Idas in A.R. appears irascible and ludicrous, cf. esp. 3.556f., 1252f. Aeetes' threats in 3.576f., easily undermined by Argos and his mother in 3.606f., are also grotesque, cf. also his funny turn-out and speech in 4.219–435 and Call. fr. 7.29–34. Erysichthon's father, a tragic figure, is presented as making grotesque remarks about his son's hunger in Call. *HyDem.* 103f. During an appalling family row in Theoc. 14.23 the wife is outraged κὴφλέγετ'· εὐμαρέως κεν ἀπ' αὐτᾶς καὶ λύχνον ἅψας. Erat. *CA* 17 ἔκ τέ οἱ ὄσσε/κανθῶν παμφαίνεσκε Μοσυχλαίῃ φλογὶ ἶσον in a tense

[26] φύσει γὰρ χαρίεν πρᾶγμά ἐστι ἡ παροιμία, Demetr. *De eloc.* 156, see J. F. Kindstrand, "The Greek Concept of Proverbs", *Eranos* 76 (1978), 71–85, R. Tosi in Montanari 179f. On proverbs in Call. and Theoc. see the Indexes s.v. Proverbia viz. Proverbs in Pfeiffer and Gow (with Dover li) respectively. In epigram see E. Prittwitz-Gaffron, *Sprichwörter im griechischen Epigramm*, Diss. Gießen 1911.

moment possibly involving the murder of Hesiod alludes to the proverb Λήμνιον βλέπειν.

5.a. ἀγαθή is part of the lurking proverb (see next n.), cf. *Od.* 17.347 αἰδὼς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχρημένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρεῖναι ~ 17.352, Hes. *WD* 317 — all in proverbial phrasings. Like other abstract concepts, e.g. Ἔρις (Hes. *WD* 24), δόξα (Solon *IEG* 1.4), γνώμη (Eur. *Hipp.* 427) or ἐλπίς (Hes. *WD* 500, Pind. *I.* 8.15a), αἰδώς can be ἀγαθή or οὐκ ἀγαθή. For the idea cf. *Il.* 24.45 (αἰδώς) ἥ τ' ἄνδρας μέγα σίνεται ἠδ' ὀνίνησιν ~ Hes. *WD* 318 with West ad loc., Eur. *Hipp.* 385–6 δισσαὶ δ' εἰσίν, ἡ μὲν οὐ κακή,/ἡ δ' ἄχθος οἴκων.

5.b. ἐπὶ ἤθεσιν αἰδώ Cf. Nonn. *D.* 38.43 (Idmon) ἔχων ἐπὶ χείλεσι πειθώ/. P. toys here with the proverb αἰδὼς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς, for which cf. Eur. fr. 457, Arist. *Rhet.* 1384a34, Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 923.20 (III.447 van der Valk), *Comm. Od.* 1754.40, *App. Prov.* 1.10 (*CPG* i, 381), also known in the form αἰδὼς ἐπὶ (ἐν)[27] ὄμμασι, cf. *HHD* 214 ἐπί τοι πρέπει ὄμμασιν αἰδώς, Theogn. 85–6 ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ τε καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἔπεστιν/αἰδώς, Call. *SH* 239.7, A.R. 3.93 αἰδὼς ἔσσετ' ἐν ὄμμασιν, Anon. *HE* 33.3–4, Q.S. 14.39–40. P. substitutes ὄμμασι with ἤθεσι, cf., in a different context, *Il.* 13.121–2 ἀλλ' ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθε ἕκαστος/αἰδῶ. — ἤθεα 'characters' is where Eros takes his corrupting residence, Plato *Symp.* 195e ἐν γὰρ ἤθεσι καὶ ψυχαῖς θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων τὴν οἴκησιν ἵδρυται, then Call. *HyDel.* 296–7 ὑμέναιος/ἤθεα κουράων μορμύσσεται. — The tendency to end a hexameter with *sententiae* is well attested, see Gow on Theoc. 5.38, Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 117. On the hiatus ἐπὶ ἤθεσι see p. 81.

5.c. αἰδώ αἰδώς is the sentiment which prevents someone from conducting himself in a way that will later make him feel shame before third persons or a superior power — φόβος τις ἀδοξίας as Arist. *EN* 1128b14 put it. As it functions proleptically, it is a 'negative' virtue, cf. expressions like κωλύει αἰδώς, ἴσχει αἰδώς, ἐρύκει αἰδώς, αἰδοῖ ἐεργομένη etc. The sentiment felt after the deed is described by

---

[27] ἐπί is a variant of ἐν in Theoc. 4.7 ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀπώπει, see G-P on Leon. Tar. *HE* 31.3, Campbell on A.R. 3.93. In view of the proverb at work Bergk's ἔπι (= ἔπεστι), accepted by Powell, is unsuitable. On the idea that αἰδώς or ἀναίδεια resides in the eyes, cf. Arist. Ἐρωτικός fr. 98, [*id.*] *Physiogn.* 807b29 ἀναιδοῦς σημεῖα ὀμμάτιον ἀνεπτυγμένον καὶ λαμπρόν, Longin. *De subl.* 4.4 οὐδενὶ οὕτως ἐνσημαίνεσθαι τὴν τινων ἀναίδειαν ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς and see Richardson on *HHD* 214, Hollis on Call. *Hec.* fr. 49.14–5, Cairns 1993, 98 n. 1.

αἰσχύνη.[28] — For the elsewhere unattested excision of -ς Schwyzer i, 478 compared feminine nouns such as τροφώ (-ός), ἀηδώ (-ών), εἰκώ (-ών) etc. Conceivably, the form contributed to an intended rhetorical effect. Arist. *Poet.* 1458b1 approved of such phenomena as contributing εἰς τὸ σαφὲς τῆς λέξεως καὶ μὴ ἰδιωτικόν. αἰδώς is common at the end of a hexameter in all periods[29] and echoes of αἰδῶ-clausulae and of the epic habit of other -ώ or -ῶ hexameter-endings would have facilitated the excision. To quote but some examples cf. *Il.* 15.561 = 661 αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ/, *Il.* 22.60 = 24.487 = *Od.* 15.348 = Hes. *WD* 331 ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ/, *Il.* 7.409 οὐ γάρ τις φειδώ/, *Od.* 14.92 οὐδ' ἔπι φειδώ/~ Hes. *WD* 369, *Il.* 4.24, *al.* = *Od.* 8.321, *al.* δῶ/(all 23x clausular in Homer), Simias *CA* 10 Δωδώ/.

IIa. *Parthenius* Erot. path. *2 and Philitas'* Hermes

Parthenius provides a summary of (part of) P.'s hexameter poem *Hermes*. Parth.'s proceedings with his sources and the credibility of the notations are of importance. In general, it seems that Parth. follows mainly one source, enriching it with additional information from others, in which case he signifies the addition with vague expressions such as οἱ πλείους or τινες (cf. 11.3, 14.1, 5, 26.2).[30] Was P. the direct source of Parth. in his Polymele-chapter? As stated in the prologue, Parth.'s sources are poetic.[31] The content of ch. 2 relates

[28] See Parker 1983, 189 ("self-restraint expressed through respect for recognised values"), Ll-J, "Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Culture", in *id.* ii, 253–80, Cairns 1993, further bibliography in S. West on *Od.* 2.64–6.

[29] Cf. *Il.* 15.129, 657, 24.44, Hes. *WD* 192, *HHD* 214, *Cypria EGF* 7.5, [Hes.] *Scut.* 354, fr. 204.82, Theogn. 253, 653, 1067, Ion *IEG* 30.1, *CEG* 102.1 (*c.* 400 BC), Erinna *SH* 401.34, A.R. 3.652, 681, 785, 1068, Arat. 493, Isyllus 16 (*CA*, 133), Diosc. *HE* 13.5, *GVI* 2061.12 (3rd cent. BC), 1518.3 (2nd/1st cent. BC), 1695.5 (1st cent. AD), *SEG* 33.1042.5 (late Hellenistic), Antip. Thess. *GPh* 76.3, Opp. *Hal.* 1.722, 2.43, *al.*, [*id.*] *Cyn.* 3.372, Q.S. 14.55, *al.*, *Orac. Sib.* 1.49, 90, *al.*, Claud. *AP* 9.139.5, Orph. *Arg.* 409, 883, Agath. *AP* 5.302.13, Paul. Sil. *AP* 5.286.3, Joann. Gaz. 1.46, Musae. 98, Nonn. 9x.

[30] On the similar question in Antoninus Liberalis P. M. C. Forbes-Irving, *Metamorphosis in Greek Myth*, Oxford 1990, 20–4 deemed that Ant. draws on one source each time and remains faithful to it, the poetic digressions being "a feature of Hellenisitic narrative", see also M. Papathomopoulos, *Antoninus Liberalis*, Budé 1968, xvi–xix.

[31] Parth. claims to summarise τὰ παρά τισι τῶν ποιητῶν κείμενα. This may only mean that he is aware of a poetic treatment on the same subject and may well be

to the *Od.*: the account of Odysseus' Aeolus-sojourn in Homer is essentially defective. Initially, Aeolus welcomes and hosts the hero and when the latter asks to depart he even puts the winds into an utricle to guarantee a safe journey. Odysseus' toils would have ended there, if his companions were not jealous of the many gifts he was carrying home. As they open the sack, the winds drive them all back to Aeolus. The hero uses soothing words again (*Od.* 10.70 μαλακοῖσι καθαπτόμενος ἐπέεσσιν) and asks for help, but this time Aeolus refuses. As a justification he produces the claim that Odysseus is hated by the gods, *Od.* 10.73–5.

What happened between the first and the second visit to Aeolus? P. must have found the explanation produced in the *Od.* as insufficient. His suspicions would be reinforced by the fact that in Homer the episode is expounded by Odysseus, a narrator particularly skilful in dissimulating the full truth (one wonders how the Philitan Odysseus would present to Aeolus the Calypso and Circe episodes). P.'s own story does not only interpret the Homeric data on geography (see fr. 1.1a) and modify the traditional sequence of Odysseus' adventures (see fr. 3), but also supplements the lacunose Homeric narration providing an aetium for the inexplicable wrath of Aeolus in Odysseus' second visit.[32] The idea is similar to a liaison between Hermes and Calypso in Hes. *Cat.* fr. 150.30–1 Κεφαλλ]ήνων ἀγερώχων φῦλον . ./οὓς τέκεν Ἑρ]μάωνι Καλυψὼ πότνια νύμφη, an affair prompted, as Odysseus' affair with Polymele, by the god's innocent visit to Calypso in *Od.* 5, see West 1985, 131–2. Later embroidering with regards to Odysseus' Homeric women included Circe and Calypso (*in primis* Hes. *Theog.* 1011f.), and, interestingly, there are plays about Nausicaa too in Old and Middle comedy, see K-A on Eubul. *PCG* 68.

Learned vocabulary such as Μελιγουνίς or ἀλινδουμένη suggest that the author of the prototype is an erudite poet. The story shows

---

untrue in treatment of stories of the recent past (e.g. ch. 8), see Lightfoot 246f., who considers poetical historiography, *historia fabularis*, works of paradoxography or mythographical manuals as other likely sources.

[32] Cf. now Latacz 1999, 206f. Odysseus hushes up his second visit when he narrates his adventures to his wife in *Od.* 23.14–5. In Ovid's account of the Aeolus-episode, *Met.* 14.223–33, the second visit is also omitted due to the narrator's wish (Macareus, a son of Aeolus) to present his father as positively as possible.

him to be a Homeric scholar as well. Most of the notations in Parth. indicate sources dating from the 3rd cent. BC. Besides, no attestation of an erotic affair between Odysseus and Polymele survives other than this Parthenian account. In general, the Aeolus-sojourn was neglected in both literature and art.[33] A neglected theme subjected to an innovative treatment is the kind of story Parth. collects. Most importantly, there is the notation: ἱστορεῖ Φιλίτας Ἑρμῇ. Earlier it was commonly accepted that Parth. was the author and the notator of his chapters. R. Hercher, *Philologus* 7 (1852), 451f. refuted this belief with arguments winning almost universal approval.[34] Ten out of thirty-six chapters lack a notation. As some of the poetic texts cited as sources are recovered, it is confirmed that they cannot be Parth.'s immediate sources, cf. e.g. Euph. *SH* 415.i.12–8 ~ *Erot. path.* 13. The confidence of the notator about his accuracy varies too; in ch. 8 e.g. he cites a source acknowledging that the names there are different than in Parth. Parth., in the body of his text, does not appear keen on indicating his sources. The notations may be the work of an erudite editor of Parth. who had access to recondite Hellenistic verse. This by no means implies that they are misleading. Where verifiable, they are accurate in identifying the source or a source handling the theme of the chapter in a similar way. In the case of ch. 2 the uniqueness of the story renders Philitan authorship most likely.

If the notation on the Odysseus/Polymele episode is not supplied by Parth., a question of survival emerges. There is no reason to doubt that the grammarians would commence the quest for Parth.'s sources the day following the publication of his work in Rome. His own source-book does not seem to have been accessible to many. Odysseus' narration to Aeolus, the part most relevant to Homer, may well have survived independently in an anthology which would

---

[33] "Pour Odysseus lui même pas de document significatif", O. Touchfeu-Meynier, *LIMC* VI.1, 960, see also Brommer 68–9. Nothing is to be made out of two Etruscan scarabées (*LIMC* VI.2, 645 nos 64 and 65), in which a young person often identified with Hermes opens the utricle of Aeolus, even if the identification is correct, see Touchefeu-Meynier 272, G. Comporeale, *LIMC* VI.1, 980.

[34] Cf. *id.*, *Hermes* 12 (1877), 306–19, Rohde 1914, 122–5. The best review of the question is by C. Wendel, *Gnomon* 8 (1932), 148f. Von Blumenthal, *RE* XVIII.4.1896 still thought a definitive answer to be impossible. Cameron 1995, 124–5 argues against the *opinio communis*. See also J. Stern, *Parthenius, Erotica Pathemata*, N.Y. 1992, 106–8, Lightfoot 246f.

eventually yield the three fragments in Stobaeus. Parth. pays little attention to this part and at a later stage his story would hardly be identifiable on the basis of such a piece in an anthology. As P.'s story provides supplementary evidence for an Odyssean episode, a prose-summary may have recorded it as a noteworthy piece of information. It can not be determined whether such a postulated summary was contained in Pamphilus' 95-books-long Λειμών, as P. E. Oder, *De Antonino Liberali*, Diss. Bonn 1886, 46 suggested (cf. Lightfoot 250–1). The presence of such Hellenistic stories in the Homeric Σ (mostly on the *Il.*) by the so-called *Mythographus Homericus* is noteworthy. They are adduced to provide additional information about — or a variation of — the Homeric passage in question. In the case of Euph. a plethora of information survives this way. Spicy stories would be particularly welcome.[35] But independently of such a possibility, this marginal notation could be an early Σ perpetuated in the MSS tradition.

As the final part of Parth.'s summary indicates, P. made use of motifs from Euripides' *Aeolus* (see nn. 1.2f, h, i, 3c, d). In the early twenties of the 5th cent. Euripides produced *Aeolus* (frr. 13a–41 Kannicht), the subject of which was the incestuous love of Macareus and Canace, two of Aeolus' children. Canace becomes pregnant and Macareus persuades their father to allow his children to marry each other. The couples are to be defined by lot, but luck does not favour the lovers. In obscure circumstances, Aeolus finds out the truth, Canace commits suicide and is soon followed by Macareus. The *hypothesis* of the play stops before its last part, but the loss is mitigated by Sostratus *Tyrrhenica FGrH* 23 F 3: Αἴολος δὲ περὶ τούτων μαθὼν τῇ θυγατρὶ ξίφος ἔπεμψεν· ἡ δὲ ὡς νόμον δεξαμένη τὸν σίδηρον αὐτὴν ἀνεῖλε. Μακαρεὺς δὲ τὸν γεννήσαντα προεξιλεωσάμενος ἔδραμεν εἰς τὸν θάλαμον· εὑρὼν δὲ τὴν ἀγαπωμένην αἱμορραγοῦσαν τῷ αὐτῷ ξίφει

[35] Σ bT *Il.* 1.138a (I.50 Erbse) already know from an unstated source of an unHomeric mistress of Odysseus at Troy: Ὀδυσσέως δὲ γέρας Λαοδίκη ἡ Κύκνου, see Stanford 252 n. 7. Σ T (ex.) *Il.* 14.296a (III.636 Erbse) inform us of Euph.'s *CA* 99 treatment of Hera's secret liaison (or rape) by the giant Eurymedon and the anger of Zeus when he learned about it. Σ T[t] *Il.* 15.639c (IV.134 Erbse) anonymously report Diotimus' *SH* 393, an author almost as obliterated as P., eccentric story that Eurystheus was Heracles' παιδικά, διὸ καὶ τοὺς ἄθλους ὑπομεῖναι. Σ A *Il.* 3.314 (I.415 Erbse) transmit a tradition originating in Stesich. *PMGF* 224 and treated (as a naughty deed?) by Euph. *CA* 56 and Alex. Aet. *CA* 13 that Hector is not a son of Priam but of Apollo.

τὸν βίον περιέγραψε, whence Plut. *Par. min.* 312c–d. Today, only fragments containing mostly maxims survive but in antiquity, because of its revolutionary theme, the play became instantly renowned and soon invited the mockery of comedy, thus winning a lasting fame.[36]

Nowacki 34–5, assisted by some remarks of Rohde 1914, 107f. on the influence of Eur.'s novel erotic stories on Hellenistic poetry, was the first to notice the impact of *Aeolus* on this part of *Hermes* (cf. Nesselrath 207 n. 90). There are many Euripidean elements taken up as they were or adapted by P.: a secret love-affair, a secret product of the impermissible liaison (son or gifts), deceit of Aeolus (in Eur. Canace gives birth to her child τῷ νοσεῖν προ[σποιη]τῶς, *hypothesis* 26), dramatic revelation of the truth followed by Aeolus' wrath and intention of punishing his daughter, an attempt to save the child by the nurse supplanted in P. by an attempt to save Polymele herself by her brother (both successful), and an incestuous marriage of Canace/Macareus as of Diores/Polymele — but with a wide difference of emphasis within their respective contexts: the secret love-affair is picked up from Eur. to be rendered in P. a component element of his interpretation of the relevant Homeric episode.

As Parth. seems to directly draw on P., one needs to read between the lines to ascertain where the weight of the prototype would lie. In general, Parth. narrates ὅτι ἐν βραχυτάτοις stories μὴ αὐτοτελῶς λελεγμέναι and this gives plenty of room for speculation. Couat 73 ("its theme was entirely erotic"), Rohde 1914, 80 and Christ-Schmid-Stählin 122 thought that the central theme of the episode was the love-affair of Polymele and Odysseus and its implications. Similarly, Cessi 1908, 139, von Blumenthal 2167, Barber, ²*OCD*, 814 followed by Trypanis 267, believed that the central theme of the episode was the emotions of Polymele. Hellenistic poets were fond of dealing with the erotic affairs of heroes for whom the tradition had a certain respect. However, P. employs the erotic liaison to make up for the deficiences of the Homeric episode. It does not appear that love as such had a prominent place in *Hermes* (Kuchenmüller 42 was right

---

[36] On *Aeolus* see H. J. Mette, *Lustrum* 23 (1981), 16–22 and H. van Looy, *AC* 60 (1991), 300, Gareth Williams, *CQ* n.s. 42 (1992), 201–9, R. Kannicht, *JHAW* (1995), 28–9, Chr. Mülke, *ZPE* 114 (1997), 37–55. The play became a favourite target of Aristophanes and of later comedians (Eriphus *Aeolus PCG* 1, Antiphanes *Aeolus PCG* 19–20), see Nesselrath 205–9. Scheibner 112–3 and Lightfoot 382 wondered whether the Egyptian habit of fraternal marriage influenced P., but there is no need to stray from a clear literary background.

on this). For Odysseus it is a welcome relief (ἦν ἡ μονὴ καὶ αὐτῷ ἡδομένῳ), but the main interest of the hero is to charm Aeolus with exciting and packed narrations. While Odysseus methodically works on Aeolus he — as a secondary sequel — provokes and gives in to the erotic desire of Polymele. Polymele is not reported to intervene with Aeolus for Odysseus' sake, as Eilebie in *Erot. path.* 1.2 ἰδοῦσαν τὸν Λύρκον εἰς ἔρωτα ἐλθεῖν καὶ πολλὰ τοῦ πατρὸς δεηθῆναι κατασχεῖν αὐτόν, nor is there any need to do so since Aeolus on his own is amicably disposed towards his guest. Besides, Parth.'s programmatic (stories) μὴ αὐτοτελῶς λελεγμέναι implies a selection of those constituents which are of interest to him. He is mostly interested in the erotic aspect of the story. Moreover, there is no trace of erotic typology, such as suffering, first venue etc. In the final section of Parth.'s report Polymele is caught rolling with Odysseus' gifts in a state of desperation. Tension rises when deceived Aeolus angrily blames Odysseus and plans to punish Polymele. The incident is pointed out in Parth., but the scene may have been coloured with grotesque overtones (see fr. 5) and the final outcome remains harmonious. One may claim that P. insisted on the happier aspects of the story (cf. nn. 1.2a, 1.2d).

It is in vain that one will look to Polymele for the central character of the episode. That appears to have been Odysseus and his cunning methods to attain his objects. The focus is on him alone: his companions, if he still had any with him, are kept completely off-stage and a substantial portion of the episode would be occupied by his narration. Stobaeus' three fragments (2, 3, 4) are derived from it. Homer mentions it with the colourless *Od.* 10.16 καὶ μὲν ἐγὼ τῷ πάντα κατὰ μοῖραν κατέλεξα. Odysseus is the type of hero who entertains people with stories in return for hospitality and gifts. His narration, as a non-amatory element, is disproportionately mentioned in Parthenius. He could omit a large portion of Odysseus' stories without significant loss for the plot. The shrewdness of the main character seems to have been the predominant element permeating the whole episode.

IIb. *Title and Content*

The title *Hermes* seems incompatible with the content of the Odysseus episode. D. Ruhnken (*Epist. Crit.*, 284, *pace* P. Sakolowski, ed. Parth.,

Leipzig 1896, 7) attempted to emend ἱστορεῖ Φιλίτας Ἑρμῇ into ἱστορεῖ Φιλητᾶς <καὶ> Ἑρμη<σιάναξ>. The question gave rise to different proposals. Kuiper 147 tried to explain the title by the kinship of Odysseus and Hermes through Autolycus. Autolycus gives Odysseus his name in *Od.* 19.394f. Hermes endowed him with exceptional versatility and from this point of view he is an ideal patron of the hero. Later Autolycus was said to be a son of Hermes and maternal grandfather of Odysseus, whence Odysseus is genealogically connected with Hermes.[37] Kuiper's suggestion entails that Odysseus was the central figure of all *Hermes*, but no trace of a treatment of an episode other than Aeolus' survives in the Homeric Σ (e.g. information about an enhanced role of Hermes) or elsewhere.

Kuchenmüller 47–8 suggested that *Il.* 16.179–92 could offer a solution. In that Iliadic passage Polymele, daughter of Phylas, provokes the love of Hermes, sleeps secretly with him and bears Eudorus. Kuchenmüller thought that P. modelled his own story on this passing genealogical digression. The two stories are intrinsically different[38] and there is no good reason to abandon the Odyssean context of P.'s story. The fact, though, that Hermes and Odysseus share a woman with the same name may bear some significance in its own right. Von Blumenthal 2167 was more drastic: as he thought that the central figure of the poem is Polymele he proposed as title ἐν Ἑρμῇ (*sc.* Πολυμήλης), referring to a gloss interpreted by Hsch. ε 5947 as ἔξοδος. Beyond the fact that such a title would be at least obscure, if not incompatible with the content of the story, it is unlikely that P. would use a gloss as a title. Hellenistic poets show a tendency to use names as titles.

Maass 1894, 12 attributed the title to the fact that Hermes assumes an important role as helper of Odysseus in Homer (see ff.). Maass'

---

[37] This kinship is a post-Homeric device. Autolycus appears as son of Hermes first in Hes. *Cat.* fr. 64.17–8, then Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 120, [Apollod.] 1.9.16 and Ov. *Met.* 11.312. Σ *Od.* 10.277 (I.466 Dindorf) note that in Homer Hermes is not the father, but the godfather of Autolycus, οὐχ ὡς Αὐτολύκου πατήρ· Ὅμηρος τοῦτο οὐ δηλοῖ, see Russo on *Od.* 19.394. One would like to see it as a fiction of genealogical mythography.

[38] Hermes in the *Il.* is enamoured with Polymele in his capacity as νόμιος, cf. Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1053.52 (III.831 van der Valk) τὸ δὲ Πολυμήλη εὐμόρφῳ οἰκεῖον γυναικὶ ὄνομα διὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν θρεμμάτων πολλὰ ἕδνα and see J. Zwicker, *RE* XXI.2.1766. Cf. also *Il.* 14.489–91 Ἰλιονῆα/υἱὸν Φόρβαντος πολυμήλου, τόν ῥα μάλιστα/Ἑρμείας Τρώων ἐφίλει καὶ κτῆσιν ὄπασσε with Janko ad loc.

point does not solve the title-question as Hermes does not appear to be of direct help to Odysseus in the story which Parth. narrates (but see fr. 1.2d). Even if he did, this would not mean much: "velutsi Apollonius *Argonauticis* inscripsisset Ἥρη" noted Kuchenmüller 46. A modern trend tends to regard the Odysseus episode in *Hermes* as a digression.[39] The effort to downgrade the importance of the Odysseus episode in *Hermes* is directed by the need to somehow accommodate together both the title of P.'s poem and the content of the Parthenian chapter. The reasoning seems unconvincing. The Odysseus portion might not have been very extended, but it could not have been a short digression of the length of e.g. Alex. Aet.'s account of Orpheus' death in *Apollo CA* 3 (quoted in *Erot. path.* 14), as it contained dialogues in direct speech which would require a longer treatment. And surely the unheard (or — at the very least — recondite) story would stand quite oddly as a passing digression without due documentation.

Each of these suggestions contributes an aspect of a possible association of Hermes with Odysseus. The view that P.'s poem consisted only of the episode summarised in Parth. used to be almost unanimously accepted,[40] but it is a dead-end for the title-question. Others thought that *Hermes* was a collection of minor poems in different metres and on different subjects. According to Bach 29, this view goes back to Heerenius (*Comment. de fontibus Eclog. Stob.*, Göttingen 1792, 157); it was then revived by Legrand 436.

Nowacki 27 first noted that "videtur Philitas finxisse et aliorum heroum fata erroresque narrasse quae sub Mercuri tutela pertulissent: inde titulus Ἑρμῆς". Hermes is ἡγεμόνιος, ἀγήτωρ and πομπαῖος and in this capacity he escorted travellers and guided many heroes

[39] "(P. wrote) a formal epyllion of the narrative type containing as a main subject some exploits of Hermes with the Polymela story as a digression" (M. M. Crump, *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid*, Oxford 1931, 27), "Parthenius does not necessarily summarise an extended narrative" (Hutchinson 11 n. 15), "Parth. ... summarizes a story ... which occurred in the poem. We cannot be sure that this was the main theme" (Hollis 1990, 24 n. 6), "(Parth. *Erot. path.* 2) is not necessarily a full or accurate summary" (F. Williams, [3]*OCD*, 1164). Knox 65 came up with two explanations: either that the notator has erred in citing P. by a possible reference to the Iliadic Polymele in *Hermes*, or, more likely, that P. treated the subject "only briefly, in a digression triggered by the name of Polymele".

[40] See Couat 73, Körte-Händel 254. Different views are summarised by K. Kost, *KWH*, 195. Wil. 1884, 191 n. 33 thought, too, that "das Epyllion ging überhaupt den Odysseus an".

in their adventures.[41] But his artfulness makes him not a simple concomitant. Priam's itinerary under the escort of Hermes in *Il.* 24.349–467 is suggestive as in a relatively small journey the god combines protection with shrewdness (see Erbse 1986, 67–70). The poem could have consisted of stories of different events that occurred to heroes whom Hermes had escorted in their deeds. The connective element would be the god himself. It cannot be demonstrated whether the adventurers were all children or grandchildren of Hermes as Autolycus' parentship of Odysseus would suggest, but it may well be so, esp. if the treatment of the secret marriage of Jason, a grandchild of Hermes through Autolycus, and Medea in the house of Alcinous (fr. 22) comes from *Hermes*. In the case of Chiron and Pholus' entertainment of Heracles (Theoc. 7.149f., see ff.), spiritual parentship through Autolycus would again be involved. Hermes' offspring tend to inherit his shrewdness, as did Erytos and Echion in A.R. 1.51–2 πολυλήιοι Ἑρμείαο/υἱέες εὖ δεδαῶτε δόλους, and others. To judge by the one story we know, the episodes in *Hermes* would be fictional or recondite rather than the most widely known. They would be agreeable and witty and possibly of erotic character. P. would not treat the full myth each time, but would pick out incidents which would fit his intentions. Subsequently, we seem to be dealing with a *Kollektivgedicht* as the *Leontion* of Hermesianax, the *Apollo* of Alex. Aet. or the *Erotes* of Phanocles. These poems are of some length and tend to conclude with a grandiose ending, here possibly with an adventure of the god himself.[42]

Theoc. 7 may be a poem replete with allusions to *Demeter*. In 148f. the poet wonders whether the Castalian Nymphs have mixed a wine akin to the wines of Polyphemus/Odysseus and Chiron/Heracles. These subjects involving monstruous mythical creatures treated in a light way may be evoked as subjects treated by P. in a now lost

---

[41] See the list in G. Siebert, *LIMC* V.1, 292. On Hermes guiding travellers see Roscher i, 2381–83, H. Herter, *RhM* n.s. 119 (1976), 208–10. Cf. Zeus' address to Hermes in *Il.* 24.334–5 Ἑρμεία, σοὶ γάρ τε μάλιστά γε φίλτατόν ἐστιν/ἀνδρὶ ἑταιρίσσαι, καί τ' ἔκλυες ᾧ κ' ἐθέλῃσθα.

[42] Interestingly, he and Odysseus share an important woman. Σ Theoc. 7.109–10b, c (105.4 Wendel) give Hermes a prominent place among Penelope's lovers, cf. Pind. fr. 100, Hdt. 2.145.4, [Apollod.] *Epit.* 7.38 and see M. A. Harder on POxy. 4306.2.ii.2f., Hopkinson on Nonn. *D.* 24.86–7. Philod. *De piet.* (PHerc. 243.iii) provides a list of Hermes' erotic affairs treated in Hes. *Cat.* (p. 190a in ed. Hes., OCT 1990).

poem or poems. Conceivably, they could both be accomodated in *Hermes* (already assumed by Kuchenmüller 21 n. 8; Weingarth 173 thought of Philoxenus) as the first story involves Odysseus at his best, the second Heracles, who is associated with Hermes in a fashion similar to Odysseus' via Autolycus (cf. [Apollod.] 2.4.9, Theoc. 24.115f.). They both involve funny hospitality stories ending up in a disaster for the hosts. Polyphemus is described as τῆνον τὸν ποιμένα (sic) . . ./τὸν κρατερὸν (!) Πολύφαμον, ὃς ὤρεσι νᾶας ἔβαλλε (!), who got drunk on Odysseus' wine and was presented dancing. Pholus' entertainment of Heracles, here envisaging the presence of Chiron as well, provides plenty of comic footholds, cf. [Apollod.] 2.5.4. This was a favourite topic in Sicilian literature, in which P. appears to have a particular interest. This reference in Theoc. is the next attestation after Stesich. *PMGF* S 19 (see G. Massimilla in L. Dubois (ed.), *Poésie et lyrique antiques*, Lille 1995, 46f.), though one lost Sicilian comedy was written on this subject, Epich. fr. 66 Ἡρακλῆς ὁ πὰρ Φόλῳ, and an Attic one, Ar. Δράματα ἢ Κένταυρος frr. 278–88. Hermesianax, a 'pupil' of P., may have treated the episode too (*CA* 10).

Odysseus' controversial sojourn with Aeolus would most suitably find a place in such a poem. The Odyssean role of Hermes, to which Maass drew attention, is helpful. Hermes is the god advancing Odysseus' *nostos*, cf. *Od.* 1.84–7, 5.29–31, 10.275f., and the hero acknowledges his help with a sacrifice in *Od.* 14.435–6. In Soph. *Phil.* 133 Odysseus on Lemnos evoces Hermes too: Ἑρμῆς δ' ὁ πέμπων δόλιος ἡγήσαιτο νῷν. What is even more important is the intellectual bond linking Odysseus and Hermes. Autolycus, to whom Kuiper drew attention, is the mediator through whom the hero inherits the qualities of his spiritual father. In *Od.* 6.148 Odysseus tells the Phaeacians a μῦθος κερδαλέος, a phrase applied in the extant early epic only to Hermes in *HHHerm.* 162, 260, 463. In *ibid.* 13 new-born Hermes is attributed the traditionally Odyssean πολύτροπος. A comparison of the Homeric Odysseus and Hermes in the *HHHerm.* shows that an affinity between the two had been established very early on.[43]

---

[43] See on this K. W. Osterwald, *Hermes-Odysseus*, Halle 1853, P. Philippson, *MH* 4 (1947), 12–4, Stanford 248 n. 12, L. H. Pratt, *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar*, Ann Arbor 1993, 63–7.

The episode would not be dealt with at great length. P. restricts his protagonists to the minimum: Odysseus, Aeolus and Polymele. Diores' appearance at the end of the episode is necessitated by the intended happy-ending. There is no further trace of Aeolus' numerous children in Parth., although in *Od.* 10.8–9 these αἰεὶ παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητέρι κεδνῇ/δαίνυνται, cf. also Q.S. 14.477–8. Odysseus' companions do not figure at all in Parth. and in view of the modification of the Homeric chronology P. might have conveniently disposed of them. A large portion of the episode would be occupied with Odysseus' narration in which his Underworld experience seems to have received the attention due. Odysseus knows how to summarise in Homer, cf. e.g. *Od.* 23.306–46 effectively reviewing the whole narration to the Phaeacians and see M. J. Apthorp, *CQ* n.s. 27 (1977), 7–9, R. B. Rutherford, *JHS* 86 (1986), 154 n. 52. One would think that the story would have been dealt with within the moderate length of an epyllion like *Megara* or Moschus' *Europa*.

As the correspondence between Parth. and Homer shows, to build his own story P. relies on every single line of the Homeric passage on Odysseus' Aeolus-visit. This is, nevertheless, concisely narrated. The best-recounted reception and entertainment the hero experienced is that in Phaeacia (Reece 101–21). P., to cover the gaps, turned to it. The Phaeacians heard the same stories as the Aeolids and, most importantly, the Odysseus/Polymele and Odysseus/Aeolus couples are potential parallels to the Odysseus/Nausicaa and Odysseus/Alcinous ones: a daughter of hospitable parents is attracted to the stranger. Polymele and Nausicaa (both κοῦραι, see n. 1.2g) seem to share the virtue of αἰδώς (the first if only superficially, fr. 5) and Odysseus' narrative skills elicit the admiration and praise of his listeners in both cases. In P., Odysseus at Aeolus might have appeared without comrades, as in Homer at Alcinous. Some 'Phaeacian' elements could have been exploited by P. with a highly ironic effect: in *Od.* 7.169–71 Alcinous asks his dear son Laodamas to stand up and offers Odysseus his distinguished place at the table. In 7.136–8 the Phaeacians pour a libation to Hermes before going to bed. In 7.299–301 Alcinous, having full trust in Odysseus, criticises Nausicaa's prudent decision not to take him in her chariot while crossing the city-street. In 8.546–7 Alcinous naively declares that a stranger (like Odysseus) holds the status of a brother "for those who have even the slightest grasp of understanding".

IIc. *Influence*

Hermes was not P.'s best known poem but it was an important step in the application of his literary programme, which aimed at introducing an unheroic treatment of heroic figures. The title may already make a literary point, as Hermes was the most unheroic of gods. He plays little part in the *Iliad* (Richardson on *Il.* 24.333–48) and in 21.497f. he wittily declines to fight against Leto, cf. Σ Gen. ad loc. (> Duris *FGrH* 76 F 100) καταφρονητὴς ἦν πολέμου· ὁ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμος ἄλλων, τὸ δὲ Ἑρμοῦ κηρύκιον †καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν πόλεμον καταστρέφεται, see Eitrem, *RE* VIII.1.782.62f., Erbse 1986, 75. Eratosthenes, two generations after P., wrote a poem inscribed *Hermes* which treated issues as broad as some hilarious stories about the childhood of the god and the five zones of the terrestrial globe as the god saw them from the skies.

In such a poem a hero as untypical as Odysseus would play a prominent role. So would Heracles, whose involvement may be posited on the strength of Theoc. 7.149f. Both him and Odysseus enjoyed a long tradition of light treatment in comedy, esp. in Epicharmus. Monstrous figures such as Polyphemus, Pholus or Chiron (cf. Theoc. *l.l.*) could also have been given a very 'human' presentation. Besides, this poem (fr. 22?) may have introduced Jason in the unheroic fashion familiar from A.R. As such, *Hermes* would make a significant contribution to the literary history of its time. A.R., who in the *Argonautica* treated a 'heroic' subject in a novel fashion, glances at fr. 4.3 in an invocation to Eros in 4.447. Jason in 3.428–31 invokes *ananke* in a similar way as Odysseus in fr. 2 and P. may lurk in 4.993 too (the same may be true of Euph. *SH* 415.i.20). Short appearances of Aeolus in A.R. 4.764–9, 777–9, 819–22 do not seem to bear Philitan marks.[44] But the κατὰ κλέος hospitality of the Mariandyni in 2.752f. may take into account the good example of Aeolus (see fr. 1.1e). In 4.1161f. Apollonius may emphatically reject a version of the venue of Jason and Medea's marriage sanctioned by P. and may toy with aspects of the Coan's handling of this theme, see

---

[44] Campbell on A.R. 3.306 noted that features from the Odyssean episode may have been revitalised through P.'s treatment. The same could be said for Herodas 8.37 'Οδ]υσσέως ο[....] Αἰόλ[ου] δῶρον. However, in neither case emerges a direct reference to the Coan.

fr. 22. However, P. Händel's (*Lex. Alt. Welt*, 2298) proposal that this episode of *Hermes* could be the prototype of the third book of the *Argonautica* seems far-fetched.

Lyc. knew P. and took up two glosses discussed in the *Ataktoi*, fr. 33 πέλλα and fr. 44 ὄμπνιος στάχυς. In the 'Odyssey' of his *Alexandra* he may follow the same order of Odysseus' travels up to the Aeolus-visit as P. Some lines might bear traces of P. Vv. 666–7 ἄλλος δ' ἐπ' ἄλλῳ μόχθος ἄθλιος μενεῖ,/τοῦ πρόσθεν αἰεὶ πλεῖον ἐξωλέστερος and 813–4 ἄστρεπτον Ἅιδην [cf. fr. 3.1 ἀτραπόν εἰς Ἀΐδαο] δύσεται τὸ δεύτερον [cf. *Od.* 12.22]/γαληνὸν ἦμαρ οὔποτ' ἐν ζωῇ δρακών are comparable with fr. 4.2–3. In 678–80 the intervention of Hermes before the encounter with Circe is given emphasis: ἀλλά νιν βλάβης/μῶλυς σαώσει ῥίζα καὶ Κτάρος φανείς/Νωνακριάτης Τρικέφαλος Φαιδρὸς θεός. Τρικέφαλος refers to Hermes guiding travellers, see K-A on Ar. fr. 556. About Lyc.'s lost tragedy *Aeolus* we do not know much more than its existence. Since P. used the Euripidean *Aeolus*, influence on this would be possible.[45]

Call. *HyDian.* 47–8 took up the antiquarian Meligounis from P. and he may have also treated the surviving story, if the name of Macareus is correctly established in *SH* 308.3 (from Philod. *De piet.*)]ωικεναυτην/] .ι ν (ἀδελφ]ῶν C. Roberts) ἐξ ἄλλων/]φιλεῖν μακα[(Μακα[ρέα Philippson: μάκα[ρας Bergk)/]Κα[[.]] ʽλλʼ.ιμαχος in a context recording disastrous loves of gods. It can not be determined whether P. had any bearing here. In Alex. Aet.'s elegiac catalogue poem *Apollo CA* 3.11–2 Ἀνθεὺς Ἑρμείῃ ταχινῷ φίλος, ᾧ ἔπι νύμφη/μαινὰς ἄφαρ σχήσει τὸν λιθόλευστον ἔρων the surprising affinity of Antheus, provoking sudden love to his host's wife, with Hermes (discussion in Magnelli 155–6; "utpote ephebus" Meineke) may be due to a leading story-pattern in *Hermes.*

Whatever the fate of *Hermes* may have been, the Odysseus episode may have survived independently for a longer time and Parth. seems to have had direct access to it. An anonymous elegy recovered in POxy. 2885.i and printed as Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 964 provides traces of the story. Vv. 15–6 run as follows:

---

[45] Lyc.'s *Aeolus* is known from Suid. λ 837 (*TrGF* 100 T 3 > F 1a), see K. Ziegler, *RE* XIII.2321 comparing *Alexandra* 738–9, F. Schramm, *Tragicorum graecorum hellenisticae quae dicitur aetatis fragmenta*, Diss. Münster 1929, 30.

ὤ]λεσεν Ἄψυρτον Μήδη [κάσ]ιν, ἡ δε. [
Δι]ώρη ν[ε]αρῶν ἔξοχον [Αἰο]λιδέων.

In this profoundly erudite piece someone (an apparition?) addresses a woman burnt by love, adducing obscure mythological examples of disastrous loves. The material is typically Hellenistic with features recalling Euph. and Call., which might suggest Parthenian authorship. The list begins with references to notorious criminals such as Comaetho (11), Scylla (13–4) and Medea (15), with whom the woman who caused the death of Diores is set side by side. The elsewhere unattested name of Diores secures a Philitan trace but the lines envisage a disastrous finale for Diores which may be a modification meaning to serve the poet's dissuasive purposes. In contrast to Euripides,[46] the blame here falls squarely on Diores' mistress. We seem to envisage a conflation, perhaps prompted by the fact that the author of this piece noticed the Euripidean motifs in P.'s story. The name of the Aeolid at the end of 15 (Ἐπ[ιμήλη/ W. Luppe, *ZPE* 131 (2000), 21) is so placed that victimizer and victim are juxtaposed like Medea and Apsyrtus in the same verse.

Clausen 1976 noted the similarity of Polymele rolling with Odysseus' gifts to Dido in *A.* 4.645–50:

interiora domus inrumpit limina et altos
conscendit furibunda rogos ensemque recludit
Dardanium, non hos quaesitum munus in usus.
hic, postquam Iliacas vestis notumque cubile
conspexit, paulum lacrimis et mente morata
incubuitque toro dixitque novissima verba etc.

Parth. exercised considerable influence on Latin poetry and there is evidence that he influenced Virgil in particular.[47] The Roman may well have been familiar with the summaries which Parth. addressed

[46] Cf. the *hypothesis* of *Aeolus* 24–5 Μακαρεὺς μιᾶς τῶν ἀδελ[φῶν ἐ]ρασθεὶς διέφθειρεν, Sostrat. *Tyrrhenica FGrH* 23 F 3 Μακαρεὺς Κανάκης τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἐρασθεὶς ἐβιάσατο. Note, though, that Canace's love is a feature in Ov. *Her.* 11.27, 35, *al.* and possibly in Call. *SH* 308.

[47] On Parth. and Latin poetry see the references in *SH*, 291. See also R. O. A. M. Lyne, *CQ* n.s. 28 (1978), 186–7 (who is restrained regarding Parth. part of the Neoteric programme), Clausen 1987, 5–6, N. Horsfall, "Virgil, Parthenius and the Art of Mythological Reference", *Vergilius* 37 (1991), 31–6, Papanghelis 81–2, E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford 1993, 212–4, Lightfoot 14f., 168f., C. Francese, "Parthenius *Grammaticus*", *Mnemosyne* iv 52 (1999), 63–71.

to Cornelius Gallus. The two stories use a similar motif: the narration of Aeneias excites the love of Dido and when love turns out to be desperate, it causes frenzy and despair. Dido's reaction as she rushes into her chamber could be thought as Polymele's possible reaction too. Above all, Dido's holding Aeneias' gift and uttering a gloomy soliloquy bears a noticeable similarity with Polymele rolling in despair with Odysseus' gifts at her bossom. However, this is only half the truth: the sombre Virgilian milieu is different. Dido has irrevocably decided to die (4.451 *mortem orat; taedet caeli convexa tueri*) and in 4.474f. she works out the time and the manner. We are constantly reminded that Dido is raging (cf. 4.531–2) in a crescendo rhythm culminating in a vehement and insane outbreak as soon as she sees the Trojan fleet sailing off shore, 4.586f. Eventually the signs of death are clear to herself, 4.642f. She takes in her hands a sword, a gift of Aeneias, and utters a last monologue — she then falls upon it.

In the death scene of Dido, Virgil abandons his epic models and resorts, as elsewhere, to tragedy. Ajax, in the homonymous play of Soph. 815f., commits suicide by falling upon a sword (833–4), which he had received as a gift from Hector.[48] The sword in Virgil does not only function as a means of death; it is the symbol *par excellence* of the combination of love and death.[49] The sword as an object of death remains within its tragic boundaries. In P.'s poem nothing can be more remote than the notion of death: he skilfully removes the horrible end of Euripides. As a symbol of love, the sword bears some similarity with Odysseus' gifts, but then again the gifts perform a different role within their respective contexts. In Virgil, Venus designs that Dido is to fall in love through them too (1.658–60). Aeneas publicly donates some Trojan spoils to Dido for her hospitality in 1.647f. which make an impression on the Tyrians (1.709) and deeply

[48] Not a hospitality gift. On the Sophoclean passage see R. L. Kane, *Hermes* 124 (1996), 17–28. On Virgil's reception see Heinze 120 n. 59, E. Lefèvre, *Dido und Aias*, Mainz 1978, 12–5, Clausen 1987, 54–7. Ov. *Her.* 11.98 (Canace of Aeolus' sword) *pectoribus condam dona paterna meis* employs the same motif. On Dido's journey towards her death see Heinze 102–6, Clausen 1987, 50f.

[49] See R. G. Basto, "The swords of *Aen.* 4", *AJPh* 105 (1984), 333–8. Such symbols are the bed and the act of kissing it too. The sword is mentioned again in *A.* 6.457 in the highly emotional encounter of Aeneias and Dido in the Underworld, retaining both of its aspects. On the *Leitmotiv* of *Aeneid* 4 see R. F. Moorton, "Love as Death: the pivoting Metaphor in Vergil's story of Dido", *CW* 83 (1990), 153–66 with further literature.

touch Dido (1.714). Aeneias' gesture produces a very personal feeling — a constituent element of the final destruction. In a moment of high tension she still calls them *dulces exuviae* 'sweet/dear spoils'.[50] Odysseus' gifts did not provoke Polymele's love. They were given as a reward for private favours and are meant to be contrasted to the destructive stinginess that Homeric Odysseus showed towards his comrades. Dido and Polymele are two different figures too: Dido is dominant, the leader of a nation (cf. 1.360f.), Polymele is only a helpless young girl. One may argue that behind Dido's rolling around a gift of sentimental value, there may lurk Polymele's similar reaction in *Hermes*, provided that one does not lose sight of the complexity of innate, profound differences among the common elements in each poem.

Others proposed to detect Parthenian influence on other Virgilian passages. First O. Crusius, *RE* V.2.2279 and then Heinze 67 n. 126 assumed Philitan influence on *A.* 1.50f., where Aeolus *Hera admonente* raises a sea-storm. Aeolus has a similar role in the Achaeans' return from Troy in Q.S. 14.466f., which bears a noticeable similarity with this Virgilian passage both in the description of Aeolus' cave and in the subsequent sea-storm. Virgil clearly draws on this vein.[51] Crusius, *l.l.* also approached *A.* 4.507–8 (Dido) *super exuvias ensemque relictum/ effigiemque toro locat haud ignara futuri.* As Parth. reports nothing of the kind, this would entail direct Philitan dependence. The lines describe Dido's premeditated preparations for her death and are unlikely to have had a place in P.

---

[50] See R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Virgil's Aeneid,* Oxford 1987, 21–3. On Aeneias' insidious gifts to Dido see M. Paschalis, *Virgil's* Aeneid*: Semantic Relations and Proper Names,* Oxford 1997, 49–51. Dido and Aeneias exchange gifts in private too: the Dardanian sword with which Dido puts an end to her life in *A.* 4.646–7 is a *quaesitum munus.* Aeneias' cloak and sword in *A.* 4.263–4 are *dives quae munera Dido/fecerat,* cf. also 1.647–55, 659, 9.266, 11.72–5.

[51] The affinity of the passages has prompted thoughts of direct dependence of Quintus on Virgil, but there are *ad totum* and *ad partem* strong objections to that, see Heinze 44–7, F. Vian, *Quintus de Smyrne* iii, Budé 1969, 169–71, *id.* "L'Epopée grecque" in *Actes Xe Congr. Assoc. G. Budé,* Paris 1980 [1978], 75–6 with n. 66.

Demeter

I. *Commentary*

Fr. 5a

We know from the Σ Florentina that Call., in his *Aetia*-prologue fr. 1.10, referred to a short-scale poem of P. by calling it ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρος, and it has long been recognised that this is his *Demeter*. Schmitt 28 n. 10 ("da es auf des Philetas Δημήτηρ anspielt, mag es auch von dort genommen sein") deemed that the phrase depicts Philitan diction. Furthermore, Hollis 1978, 402 n. 3 (cf. *id.* 1990, 295) suggested that P. used the phrase "near the beginning" of *Demeter* so that the readers of Call. would be more easily alerted to recognize the allusion. It is a well-established practice in both Greek and Roman literature to refer to poems by a couple of striking words near their beginning, see A. S. Gratwick, *G&R* ii 38 (1991), 199f., B.-J. Schröder, *Titel und Text*, Berlin-N.Y. 1999, 16f.

P. might have been the first to use a dialectal word denoting plenty as an epithet of Demeter:[1] it is unlikely that Call. would create a bold novelty to refer to somebody else's work. This point is strengthened by the fact that neither ὄμπνια nor Θεσμοφόρος is what Call. favours of Demeter. ὄμπνια occurs only here in his extant *oeuvre* as an epithet of Demeter. Instead, he prefers the traditional πότνια (fr. 63.8, *HyDem.* 10, 49, 59) and the cases of Δημήτηρ (12x) and Δηώ (7x) by far outnumber Θεσμοφόρος, used only when no other alternative is possible, here and in fr. 63.10, an aetium for the exclusion of maidens from the Thesmophoria in Athens (on which see A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 93 (1992), 14–5). ὄμπνια is formed on and may have been suggested to P. by πότνια, the cult-epithet *par excellence* of Demeter, 5x in *HHD*, see Richardson on v. 39 (add *CEG* 317.1 (Attica, *c.* 450 BC), Adesp. *SLG* 460.11). Should the construction hark back to P., the Coan seems to have had in mind specifically the

---

[1] Such epithets naturally fit the goddess very well, cf. *inter alia* Hes. *Theog.* 912 Δήμητρος πολυφόρβης, *HHD* 4 Δήμητρος . . ἀγλαοκάρπου, Soph. fr. 754.2–3 φερέσβιος/Δηώ with Radt ad loc., Ar. *Ran.* 382–3 καρποφόρον . ./Δήμητρα, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 964, Orph. *Hy.* 40.7 θρέπτειρα θνητῶν πάντων, 43.9, Call. *HyDem.* 2 = 119 Δάματερ . . . πολυτρόφε πουλυμέδιμνε with Hopkinson ad loc., Theoc. 10.42 Δάματερ πολύκαρπε, πολύσταχυ ~ Aristocl. *SH* 206.1, Philip *GPh* 26.3.

opening of Pindar's *Hymn to Persephone* fr. 37 which began with Πότνια Θεσμοφόρε. The prototype passage suggests that two of the first words of *Demeter* could be ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρος, although the fact that Call. and Asclep. (quoted in n. b) place Θεσμοφόρος at the end of a pentameter may be more indicative for P. Parth. *SH* 609b.4 ends a pentameter in]φορος. It would appear that the initial part of *Demeter* immediately gave the solemn tone that seems to have (superficially) permeated the poem.

5a.a. ὄμπνια καρποφόρος, Hsch. ο 828 (note the dactylic sequence). The adj. is derived from ὄμπνη, which is rendered by Hsch. ο 826 as τροφή, εὐδαιμονία, cf. Σ Nic. *Alex.* 7b (p. 31 Geymonat) τῆς ὄμπης . ., ἥ ἐστι τροφή, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ Ὄμπνια, a word used in its original form ὄμπη in Call. frr. 658, 681, Nic. *Ther.* 450 (see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 681, Schmitt 84 n. 4), and is coined after πότνια, on whose accentuation see Herodian Περὶ διχρ. II.12.2 Lentz. This rare Attic word is first attested in Soph. fr. 246 ὀμπνίου νέφους, glossed by lexicographers as μέγα, πολύ, ηὐξημένον, but Pearson ad loc. was surely right in asserting that it refers to the fertilising quality of the clouds, cf. also Moschio[2] *TrGF* 97 F 6.10 καρποῦ ὀμπνίου 'nourishing'. Demeter enjoyed widespread worship in Athens[3] but ὄμπνιος is first attested as directly linked to Demeter in Call. < P. In Athens it may have originally been an ancient *vox sacra.* P. knew the word from his dialectal researches and he discussed the phrase ὄμπνιον στάχυν (from an unknown tragedy?) in *At. Gl.* fr. 44. ὄμπνιος is thereafter very often used in connection with Demeter, mostly because of the reproduction of Call. fr. 1.10, cf. also Call. *Hec.* fr. 111 ὄμπνιον ἔργον with Hollis ad loc., *ibid.* fr. 144 ὄμπνιον ὕδωρ, A.R. 4.989 (Δηώ) Τιτῆνας δ' ἔδαεν στάχυν ὄμπνιον ἀμήσασθαι, Erat. *CA* 16.17 ὄμπνιον . . καρπὸν Ἐλευσίνης Δημήτερος, Lyc. 621 Δηοῦς . . . ὄμπνιον στάχυν, Nonn. *D.* 11.213 = 31.39 ὄμπνια Δηώ ~ Pampr.

---

[2] Moschio is an Athenian contemporary of P. He is heavily influenced by Eur. and at the same time displays considerable affinity to Hellenistic practices, see Th. K. Stephanopoulos, *ZPE* 75 (1988), 19–38, *id.*, *Archaeognosia* 9 (1998), 137–54, *ibid.* 10 (1999), 51–64. Fr. 3 from *Hermes* and his *TrGF* 97 F 2 express a similar idea. His employment of ὄμπνιος may indicate that he was one of those in Athens who knew the *At. Gl.*

[3] See Deubner 40–92, A. C. Brumfield, *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their Relation to the Agricultural Year*, Salem 1981, archaeological evidence in E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica*, Wisconsin 1983, 17–37, van Straten 77–9 on votive reliefs.

3.115, 6.13 (Demeter) ὄμπνια μήτηρ, *OrphF* 280.9–10 ὄμπνια . . Δήμητρος . . ./δῶρ(α), Hsch. o 831 ὄμπνιος λειμών (Adesp. *TrGF* 594a)· ὁ τῶν πυρίνων καὶ Δημητρίων καρπῶν· ἐπεὶ Ὄμπνια ἡ Δημήτηρ and with an extension of meaning Archim. Syr.? *SH* 201.44 ταύτῃ γ' ὄμπνιος ἐν σοφίῃ, Lyc. 1264 κτῆσιν ἄλλην ὀμπνίαν κειμηλίων, Paul. Sil. *Soph.* 145 ὄμπνια Ῥώμη, 10x in Nonn. (7x of Demeter/grain, 2x of the Moon, 1x of the Sun). *IG* II.2 1352.2 (Attica, 2nd cent. AD), formerly supplemented as ἱερέως τῆς Ὀμ[πνίας Δήμητρος, should now be dismissed for τῆς Ὁμ[ονοίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων, see P. Chuvin on Nonn. *D.* 6.13. For cognates cf. Geminus *GPh* 4.4 ὀμπνιακῶν χαρίτων, Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1094 = Hsch. o 833 ὀμπνηρὸν ὕδωρ, Phot. *Lex.* 342.15 ~ Suid. o 304 ὀ<μ>πνιηρὸν ὕδωρ· τὸ τρόφιμον.

5a.b. Θεσμοφόρος is a cult-name of Demeter, first attested in a *c.* 500 BC inscription from Pheneos (*LSJ Suppl.* s.v.) and in Hdt. 6.91.2, 134.2, but here drawn on Pind. fr. 37. In antiquity, whatever its original meaning may be, it was understood to mean 'lawgiving' since Demeter was thought to have established civic life after introducing agriculture, cf. Call. *HyDem.* 18 ὡς πολίεσσιν ἑαδότα τέθμια δῶκε, Virg. *A.* 4.58 *legiferae Cereri* with Pease ad loc. and esp. Diod. Sic. 5.5.2–3, Ov. *Met.* 5.341–5 with Bömer ad loc. Asclep. *HE* 10.2 σεμνὴν . . Θεσμοφόρον/ creates a less bold novelty by bringing together two traditional attributes of Demeter (σεμνή already *HHD* 1, *al.*), cf. also, perhaps, [Call.] *Fr. inc. auct.* 786 Ἄρτεμι Κρητάων (?) πότνια τοξοφόρων. Socrates of Cos, a late Hellenistic local historian, could have discussed this denomination of Demeter in his treatise on cult-titles (Ἐπικλήσεις θεῶν).[4] There was a month's name Θεσμοφόριος in Rhodes (also Crete and elsewhere) conceivably treated in Simias Μῆνες *CA* 8 (for this interest of the erudite poets cf. Call. Μηνῶν προσηγορίαι etc., p. 339 Pf.). Dionysius of Sinope (cf. *At. Gl.* fr. 31) wrote a comedy Θεσμοφόρος, *PCG* 2.

Fr. 6

This fragment is transmitted as an antecedent to Theoc.'s reference to the Coan spring Bourina by the ancient Σ ad loc. and was first

[4] In at least twelve books (IV.499 Müller), cf. Diog. Laert. 2.47 and see *in primis* A. Tresp, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller*, Gießen 1914, 211–3, Herzog 211 and Sh-W 19. For the possibility that he took into account P. in his treatment of Dionysus Φλεύς see fr. 19 *ad fin.*

attributed to *Demeter* by G. Knaack *ap.* Susemihl i, 177 n. 17. Bourina is identified with a spring 4–5 km SW and upland of the modern town of Cos, called before its identification πηγὴ τοῦ Ἱπποκράτους.[5] Herzog 159 n. 4 declared that "die Identität ist für jeden verständigen sicher" and Zanker 1980, 373–7 (cf. also Bowie 77 n. 4) confirmed this with further arguments. It is, though, plain that the name is not a survival from ancient times but a revival of the ancient name effected by European antiquaries in the 18th cent. Water-supply is an issue not easy to address in the SE Aegean (Craik 134) and Bourina was in P.'s days — and still is — the most important spring of the island. Its waters turned out to be of vital importance when the Coans, in the form of a synoecism, removed the capital from Astypalaia to the town of Cos in 366/5 BC, a few years before P. was born (M. Moggi, *I sinecismi interstatali greci*, Pisa 1976, 333–41).

Concerning the appearance of Bourina, the Σ of Nicanor (πηγὴ . . . ἧς τὸ πρόσωπον βοὸς ῥινὶ παραπλήσιον), a contemporary eyewitness, can reasonably be taken as authoritative (Wendel 1920, 128). It would seem likely that a popular Coan belief connected the aspect of the spring with its name (Βου-ρινα). This folk-interpretation would be facilitated by the widespread association of water-sources with bulls and P. might have held it as valid in scholarly terms. Nicanor's information was understood in different ways in antiquity. Some of the Σ deemed that Bourina's outlet was actually a bull's muzzle, Σ 7.5–9k (80.3 Wendel) ἔστι δὲ ῥέουσα ἐκ πέτρας διὰ βοὸς κεφαλῆς, or a stone in that shape superimposed by Chalcon, Σ 7.5–9o (81.21 Wendel) Βούρεια δέ, ὅτι ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς βοὸς ἐκ λίθου πεποιημένης ἐδόκει τὸ ὕδωρ ἐκρεῖν οὕτω τοῦ Χάλκωνος μηχανησαμένου τε καὶ κατασκευάσαντος, whence Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 309.2 (I.479 van der Valk). However, Σ 7.5–9o elsewhere (81.24 Wendel), expressly drawing on a source ultimately relying on Nicanor, understood that the shape of the rock where the outflow of Bourina was, resembled the nose of a bull: Νικάνωρ δὲ ὁ Κῷος ὑπομνηματίζων Βούριναν τὴν κρήνην καλεῖ. συμβῆναι

---

[5] Literature on Bourina would include L. Ross, *Reisen auf den griechischen Inseln des ägäischen Meeres* i, Stuttgart-Tübingen 1845, 131–4, S. Pantelides, "Περὶ τῆς ἐν νήσῳ Κῷ Βουρίνης πηγῆς", *Πανδώρα* 12 (1861), 181–5, K. Bürchner, *RE* III.1.1067–68, *id.*, *RE* XI.2.1477, Herzog 159–61, Sudhoff 32–8, Gow on Theoc. 7.6, 7, Sh-W 16–7, Arnott 1979, 102–3, Zanker 1980, 373–7, *id.* 1987, 119–20. For the Hellenistic, elaborate spring-house and the aqueduct at Bourina see A. W. van Buren, *RE Suppl.* VIII.462, F. Glaser, *Antike Brunnenbauten (κρῆναι) in Griechenland*, Vienna 1983, 140 n. 23, R. Tölle-Kastenbein, *Antike Wasserkultur*, Munich 1990, 23–4.

γάρ φησιν ἐξ αὐτομάτου καὶ αὐτοφυῶς βοὸς ῥινὶ παραπλήσιον εἶναι τὸν τόπον, ἐξ οὗ τὴν κρήνην ἐκραγῆναι ὁ Χάλκων ἐποίησεν.

It can be established with reasonable certainty that Bourina's creation was described with some detail in *Demeter*. The incident is described by Theoc. in concise, though nebulous terms, 7.6–7 Χάλκωνος, Βούριναν ὃς ἐκ ποδὸς ἄνυε κράναν/εὖ ἐνερεισάμενος πέτρᾳ γόνυ. It is plain that a miraculous appearance of a spring, for which Chalcon used his knee, is at work here. The brevity of the description is suggestive of the fact that Theoc. refers to an incident well known to his readers. Σ 7.5–9i (79.18 Wendel), *al.* provide information about a statue of Chalcon near Bourina and some have thought that Theoc. describes here a statue in characteristic pose,[6] although this looks more like a forced late explanation perhaps facilitated by Chalcon's name, which Prodicus B 8.6 Radermacher (Σ *Il.* 16.594–5, IV.280 Erbse) had expounded as ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ χαλκοῦ κτήσεως.

No satisfactory description of Chalcon's proceedings has been adduced hitherto. Attention to the discounted Σ 7.5–9o (81.7 Wendel) may be rewarding here:

> Βούρειαν ὃς ἐκ ποδός: ὅτε ὁ Χάλκων ἐβασίλευε τῶν Κῴων, εὑρέθη ἔν τινι τόπῳ τῆς Κῶ ἡ πηγή, ἣν νῦν ὁ Θεόκριτος λέγει, μὴ πρότερον οὖσα. εὑρέθη δὲ οὕτως· ἀνηγγέλθη τῷ βασιλεῖ παρά τινος τῶν περὶ ταῦτα δεινῶν, ὅτι ὕδατος ὁ τόπος ἐκεῖνος ἐνδομυχεῖ. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτεπιστατήσας τῷ τόπῳ ηὐτούργησεν, ὅσα συνέτεινε πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος ἔκρηξιν. τοῦτο οὖν δηλοῖ τὸ 'ὃς ἐκ ποδὸς ἄνυε κράναν', ὅτι ὁ Χάλκων διὰ τῶν οἰκείων ποδῶν καὶ δι' αὐτεπιστασίας ἤνυσεν, ἤγουν κατειργάσατο καὶ κατώρθωσε, τὴν κρήνην. τὸ δὲ 'εὖ ἐνερεισάμενος πέτρᾳ γόνυ' τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ Χάλκων, οὐχὶ ὀρθοστάδην ἱστάμενος, ἀλλὰ οὕτω δεῆσαν κάμψας τὸ γόνυ καὶ καλῶς ἑδράσας καὶ στηρίξας τοῦτο τῇ πέτρᾳ τῇ πρὸς τῇ κρήνῃ αὐτοχειρὶ κατεπράξατο τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος ἔκρηξιν.

[6] See for this view Legrand 219, Cholmeley on Theoc. 7.6, Kühn 44 and S. Nicosia, *Teocrito e l'arte figurata*, Palermo 1968, 11–2. Against such a possibility cf. Wil. 1906, 255 (who would accept a relief), A. Koch, *Theokrit und die bildende Kunst*, Diss. Leipzig 1950, 46f. and Weingarth 87f. Gow ii, 134 noted that "the careful particularity of the description, and the imperfect ἄνυε, which . . . is a vivid tense, certainly lend colour to the supposition that T. has a representation of the scene in mind", but added that "a heroic statue in such a position is hardly credible"

In the present form of the Theocritean Σ, genuine information supplied by Nicanor and later elaboration are inextricably interwoven. This Σ recounts an unparalleled story. Kühn 44 n. 4, in disregard of the background which supports the concise reference of Theoc., rejected it as "eine offensichtlich *ad hoc* erfundene" addition, but the Σ seems too complicated to simply come out of thin air. It defines the dramatic time of Bourina's creation during the reign of Chalcon, i.e. the time in which Demeter visited Cos. The spring was created somewhere in Cos μὴ πρότερον οὖσα.[7] This detail emphasising that a well was created in a previously dry place is a poetic topos established in Hellenistic times, cf. Call. *HyJov.* 17f. (Arcadia's dryness before Rhea created a well), A.R. 1.1146–48 (Rhea) οὔ τι παροίτερον ὕδατι νᾶε/Δίνδυμον, ἀλλά σφιν τότ' ἀνέβραχε διψάδος αὔτως/ἐκ κορυφῆς ἄλληκτον, 4.1441f., Arat. 218–9 οὐ γάρ πω Ἑλικὼν ἄκρος κατελείβετο πηγαῖς,/ἀλλ' Ἵππος μιν ἔτυψε, Lyc. 247–8 (Achilleus landing in Troy) κρηναῖον ἐξ ἄμμοιο ῥοιβδήσῃ γάνος,/πηγὰς ἀνοίξας τὰς πάλαι κεκρυμμένας. 'It was announced to the king by someone competent in these things (παρά τινος τῶν περὶ ταῦτα δεινῶν) that hidden in this place lies water' the Σ goes on. It would seem that Chalcon met Demeter somewhere close to Bourina whilst he was on an expedition to find a water-source for the citizens of Cos Meropis and, as he may have recognised her immediately, asked for help (see p. 228f.). Fountains possess a divine nature themselves and are usually created by, or with the assistance of, a divine entity. Dover on Theoc. 7.6f. assumed divine assistance for the creation of Bourina. This δεινὴ entity informing Chalcon about underground water may be Demeter. It would seem that she then instructed Chalcon about the exact point and the exact way with which Bourina was to come to light.

Chalcon's proceedings are puzzling: 'not standing straight but, since it was thus needed, bending his knee and placing it well and

---

and also that "the puzzling vividness of the description might be accounted for if there was a mark in the rock traditionally said to be the imprint of Chalcon's knee". On art's influence on Hellenistic poetry in general cf. the scepticism of Hutchinson 4–5.

[7] Sh-W's 16 assertion that Chalcon "discovered" Bourina is inaccurate. In that sense cf. Long. 4.4.1 πηγῆς . . ἣν εὗρεν ἐς τὰ ἄνθη Δάφνις, but the meaning of εὑρέθη in the Σ becomes apparent from the context and from Theoc.

leaning it on the rock of the well brought about with his own hand[8] the gush of water'. Demeter's instructions with regards to Bourina's position are concealed in the vague οὕτω δεῆσαν. A reduction due to compression on this point would cause no wonder. Chalcon's proceedings may be partly clarified from the shape of the rock from which Bourina flowed. It seems that it formed some sort of a ledge, which partly accounts for the folk-etymology of the spring's name (Βου-ρινα). Chalcon 'leant firmly' with his knee on the rock's ledge and the imprint of his knee on the protruding rock gave the spring the distinctive shape of a bull's muzzle. His knee-print is implied in Theoc. 7.7 εὖ ἐνερεισάμενος πέτρᾳ γόνυ, just as Achilleus left his foot-print in the creation of a spring on the Trojan shore, Lyc. 245–6 ἅλμα . . ποδός/εἰς θῖν' ἐρείσας (adduced by Hunter on Theoc. 7.6) or Pegasus on Hippocrene in Call. fr. 2.1 = 112.6 παρ' ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου or Hermes on the Aethiopian soil *apud* Σ Lyc. 835 (261.31 Scheer) ἐν Αἰθιοπίᾳ Ἑρμῆς . . . διψήσας ἐλάκτισε τὴν γῆν καὶ ἀνέδωκεν ὕδωρ, ὅθεν καὶ Ἑρμοῦ πτέρνα καλεῖται. The process is unusual, but it is an aetium accounting for Bourina's name.

But what necessitated Bourina's creation with the knee instead of a kick with the foot, as is normally the case in such instances? In p. 229 it is shown that Demeter advised Chalcon not to follow the well-trodden way and pin-pointed Bourina, as Σ 7.5–91 say, ἔξω τῆς πεπατημένης ὁδοῦ. Chalcon might have had to stoop and walk through a narrow strait to reach that point, so that it would not be possible for him to use his foot, but only his knee. Traces of such proceedings are still extant in the Σ 7.5–9o (81.17 Wendel) αὐτὸς ὁ Χάλκων, οὐχὶ ὀρθοστάδην ἱστάμενος, ἀλλὰ οὕτω δεῆσαν κάμψας τὸ γόνυ etc. Σ 7.5–9n (81.2 Wendel) supply the information that τινὲς δέ φασιν, ὅτι οἱ στενωποὺς ὀρύσσοντες τό μὲν γόνυ ἐρείδουσι τῇ γῇ, τῷ δὲ ἑτέρῳ ποδὶ τὸ σκαπτόμενον ὑπολαμβάνουσι χῶμα καὶ ὀπίσω αὐτῶν διωθοῦνται, where the description of the particular proceedings can be discarded as a later addition but the need to comment on the digging of a στενωπός, which is in itself inexplicable, may have arisen from Chalcon's course of action at Bourina. It may not be irrelevant that

[8] αὐτοχειρί is a later distortion. From Theoc.'s authentic information we know that Chalcon used his foot, 7.6 ἐκ ποδός. On this topos in the miraculous creation of springs, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 2.4, Matthews 331. On the miraculous appearance of springs see McLennan on Call. *HyJov.* 31.

a 35 m. long path leads to the Hellenistic spring-house of Bourina, which is cut into the hillside (Sh-W 17 with reference to Sudhoff 240–5), so that P. may have combined features of the real topography of the area with aetiology and poetic symbolism. The symbolism of Chalcon's proceedings is apparent, with his toils to reach the spring's water implying the toils of the learned poet. It is this στενωπός which may be alluded to in Call. fr. 1.28 εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις.

As the scenery around Bourina might in many respects be modelled on *Od.* 17.205f., the similarity with a spring in Ithace in *Od.* 17.207 τὴν ποίησ' Ἴθακος καὶ Νήριτος ἠδὲ Πολύκτωρ, i.e. Ithace's mythical leaders (Σ ad loc., II.639 Dindorf), may not be coincidental. Gow on Theoc. 7.6 noted that Chalcon's descent via Eurypylus from Poseidon renders him a suitable founder of a spring. The spring's association with Demeter and then with the Asclepieum suggests that the Thessalian/Coan Asclepiads might have had claims for a special link with it and it may have been them who credited 'Thessalian' Chalcon with its creation (Herzog 172).

The creation of Bourina may have been described in detail in *Demeter*, but this fragment calling her by name could hardly come from that passage. νάσσατο is appropriate of wandering figures and although we are not told to whom the verb refers, Demeter is the wandering figure in the poem and Bourina is strongly associated with her. Cultic νάσσατο 'settled to found her cult' (see n. a) would make sense, if Demeter is its subject and the 'waters of Bourina' is a metonymy for 'Cos' looking forwards to the *locus amoenus*-scene at Bourina, cf. Nic. *Ther.* 486 (Demeter) Καλλίχορον παρὰ φρεῖαρ (= at Eleusis).[9] This is the meaning with which Bourina appears in Androm. *GDRK* 62.169–71 ἱλήκοις . . . Παιών,/εἴτε σε Τρικκαῖοι, δαῖμον, ἔχουσι λόφοι/ἢ Ῥόδος ἢ Βούρινα καὶ ἀγχιάλη Ἐπίδαυρος, as it becomes evident from the prototype lines in Herodas 4.1–2 χαίροις,

[9] Reference, usually to a river, standing for the land it flows through, is a well-founded poetic topos, cf. *Il.* 4.91 ἀπ' Αἰσήποιο ῥοάων (= from Lycia), Simon. *IEG* 11.29, Mimn. *IEG* 9.5, Solon *IEG* 28 Νείλου ἐπὶ προχοῇσι (= in Egypt), Eur. *Bac.* 5 πάρειμι Δίρκης νάμαθ' Ἰσμηνοῦ θ' ὕδωρ (= in Thebes), A.R. 2.866 Ἰμβρασίοισι παρ' ὕδασι (= in Samos, cf. Nic. *Alex.* 150), Theoc. 4.6 ἐπ' Ἀλφειόν (= to Olympia) ~ Pind. *O.* 1.20, *N.* 1.18, *al.*, Bacch. 6.3, Theoc. 7.151 τὸν ποιμένα τὸν ποτ' Ἀνάπῳ (= in Sicily), Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1131c Ἀθάνα, ζωτικὸν λαχοῦσα ῥεῖθρον Ἰλισσοῦ ~ Nonn. 47.265, see Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 1 Νείλου μὲν αἵδε . . ῥοαί 'this is the land of Egypt'.

ἄναξ Παίηον, ὃς μέδεις Τρίκκης/καὶ Κῶν γλυκεῖαν κἠπίδαυρον ᾤκηκας. Both Herodas and Andromachus draw on a lost hymn to Asclepius (G. Knaack, *Philologus* 7 (1894), 756), cf. Anon. *Hymn to Asclepius GDRK* 53.9–10, Strabo 8.6.15, but Herodas' original Κῶν γλυκεῖαν is replaced in Andromachus by Βούρινα. This line of P. may have stood at the beginning of the poem: Nicanor would produce his comment upon the first occurrence of the spring's name in *Demeter* and Theoc.'s commentator (Theon?) would quote that line.

The fact that Bourina would be created by Chalcon with the guidance of Demeter links the goddess with the main water-source of Cos. Demeter seems to have initiated or contributed to activities that granted Cos its prosperity in Hellenistic times. In neighbouring Samos, Hera Ἰμβρασίη (A.R. 1.186, Nic. *Alex.* 619) was also associated with the water-sources of that island. Demeter's association with springs is close: her temples and shrines are often situated on a just-out-of-the-city hill with a well in the vicinity.[10] In *HHD* 272 the goddess instructs Celeus to build her temple on a hillock above the well Callichoros. A piece of information provided by Paus. 1.38.6 Καλλίχορον, ἔνθα πρῶτον Ἐλευσινίων αἱ γυναῖκες χορὸν ἔστησαν καὶ ᾖσαν ἐς τὴν θεόν suggests that the Eleusinian cult of Demeter started as worship of a sacred well, cf. also Hsch. ε 4898 ἐπικρήναια· ἑορτὴ Δήμητρος παρὰ Λάκωσι and Demeter φρεάρροος in Athens.[11] The link played a role in the Coan cult of Demeter too. As Richardson 1974, 181 noted "at Cos, a sanctuary of Demeter and Core centring on a spring has been found, and a statue of Core beside the spring suggests their close connection (Herzog, *AA* (1901), 134ff.)", see on this fountain sanctuary Sh-W 53, Kabus-Peißhofen 91–2 with Tab. 96 (p. 302). Demeter's authority on the springs is recognised in an unparalleled poetic invention? extending the sterility-of-the-land motif in Eur. *Hel.* 1335–37 πηγὰς δ' ἀμπαύει δροσερὰς/λευκῶν ἐκβάλλειν ὑδάτων/πένθει παιδὸς ἀλάστῳ.

6.a. νάσσατο δάσαντο is a corruption going back to the archetypus of the Theocritean Σ (Wendel 1914, xvii–xviii). Heinse proposed

---

[10] See Richardson on *HHD* 271, A. Schachter in *id.* 44–5, S. G. Cole, "Demeter in the Ancient Greek City and its Countryside" in S. E. Alcock – R. Osborne (edd.), *Placing the Gods*, Oxford 1994, 199–216, Bremmer 30.

[11] See Farnell iii, 314 n. 11, more information in Richardson 1974, 18f., Ginouvès 375–82, S. G. Cole, "The Uses of Water in Greek Sanctuaries" in Hägg 164–5.

νάσσατο which became widely accepted.[12] νάσσατο often stands at the beginning of a hexameter from Hes. *WD* 639 onwards, cf. A.R. 4.1140, *al.*, Dem. Bith. *CA* 6 and probably Call. fr. 43.114. Cultic νάσσατο seems a promising possibility: in A.R. 4.988 Δηὼ γὰρ κείνῃ ἐνὶ δή ποτε νάσσατο γαίῃ Demeter 'took residence' in Corfu and founded her cult, cf. *id.* 4.1139–40 (Macris) Φαιήκων ἱερῷ ἐνὶ τηλόθεν ἄντρῳ/νάσσατο, καὶ πόρεν ὄλβον ἀθέσφατον ἐνναέτῃσιν (see Livrea on A.R. 4.275), Dike in Arat. 134 ταύτην δ' ἄρα νάσσατο χώρην, Nonn. *D.* 13.278 (Aristaeus) Μεροπηίδι νάσσατο νήσῳ, Lyc. 1041 (Telphusian Demeter) Λάδωνος ἀμφὶ ῥεῖθρα ναίουσα, of a spring in the Salmakis-epigram 16 (2nd cent. BC; Salmakis, the Nymph) Σαλμακίδος γλυκερὸν νασσαμένη σκόπελον and for the expression [Call.] *Fr. inc. auct.* 744 ὀνομακλεῖ†/Βουθούη Δρίλωνος ἐπὶ προχοῇσιν ἐνάσθη. Kayser's 65 δάσσατο 'distributed, apportioned', accepted by Diehl, is unsuitable. Bourina may be part of a *locus amoenus*, which is inadmissible of masses.

6.b. ἐν προχοῇσι In Homer προχοαί is normally the mouth of a river (*Il.* 17.263), but in *Od.* 11.242, 20.65 and Hes. *WD* 757 the term can mean 'flood, waters' of a river or of a lake, see West ad loc., Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 31, Livrea on A.R. 4.132, Campbell on A.R. 3.67. ἐν προχοῇς is as Homeric as ἐπὶ προχοῇσι which is more suitable of rivers, see Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 64 and cf. Erat. *CA* 7 'Αρύαντος ἐπὶ προχοαῖς ποταμοῖο, Theoc. Chius *SH* 738.4 Βορβόρου ἐν προχοαῖς.

6.c. μελαμπέτροιο is usually recorded as an absolute hapax and it may be one, unless Emperius was right in proposing it in (Hellenistic) 'Ion' *FGE* 1.1 μελαμπέπλοις . . ἐν γυάλοισι (P, Pl, Suid.). μέλας-compounds often form Homeric hapaxes, such as *Od.* 15.173 μελάνδετος, *Od.* 16.175 μελαγχροιής, or absolute hapaxes such as e.g. Aesch. *ScTh* 857 μελάγκροκον, Ar. *Ran.* 470 μελανοκάρδιος, Timoth. *Pers.* 134 μελαμπεταλοχίτων and later Nonn. *D.* 31.116 μελάνζωνος. Even those compounds attested more than once give out a sense of exquisiteness. It seems that these attracted the attention of Hellenistic philologists, cf. Adesp. Pap. *SH* 991 (*At. Gl.* Perp. Adscr. 1), an early

[12] D. Heinse, *Theocriti, Moschi, Bionis, Simmii quae extant cum graecis in Theocritum scholiis*, Heidelberg 1604, 336, cf. Wil. 1906, 152, *LSJ* s.v. ναίω III. Thomas 42–4 discussed the form and postulated as a subject a migrant whom he linked with the "poor fisherman" (?) of P. *CA* 17, 20.

Hellenistic *onomasticum poeticum* which in its preserved part begins with a battery of μέλας-compounds: [μαλαμπέ]ταλος, [μελάμ]φυλλα, [μελαγ]κρήπιδες, [μελα]μφαρής. P. discussed μελαγκράνινος in *Hermeneia* fr. 53. It may not be irrelevant that Σ D show a preference for such compounds, cf. μελανονεφής rendering κελαινεφής in *Il.* 2.412, μελάμπους glossing κυανόπεζα in *Il.* 11.268, both hapaxes. It is on this Philitan coinage that Theoc. 7.7 (Chalcon created Bourina) εὖ ἐνερεισάμενος *πέτρᾳ* γόνυ might depend, whence Σ ad loc. (80.3 Wendel) ἔστι δὲ ῥέουσα *ἐκ πέτρας* διὰ βοὸς κεφαλῆς, *al.*

6.d. μελαμπέτροιο Βυρίνης The phrase seems to be an exquisite variation of the Homeric formula κρήνη μελάνυδρος, *Il.* 9.14, *al.* (see Russo on *Od.* 20.158), producing a realistic image which transposes attention from the water to the surroundings of the spring. The two words are transmitted as σελασπέτροιο Βουρρίνης/Βουρίννης and each one has been variously emended. Hartung's 38 μελαμπέτρου is plainly inferior as a *lectio facilior*. Nowacki's 80 μελαμπέτροις restores a hexameter unit but the successive spondees in the 4th and the 5th foot gain only faint support from *Hermes* fr. 4.3. μελαμπέτροιο, a *difficilior* reading, seems sound. One would prefer the striking word of the verse to refer directly to the fountain. The -οιο genitive is also supported by another consideration: as the Philitan phrase seems to emulate the Homeric clausula *Il.* 16.160 = 21.257 = Theogn. 959 κρήνης μελανύδρου/, which is possible only with a contracted genitive singular (see Janko on *Il.* 16.156–63 *ad fin.*), a change in the established *sedes* would bring about a change in the form too.[13]

6.e. Βυρίνης is Bach's 55 emendation. Heinse preferred Βορίνης and was followed by Wil. 1906, 152. Bourina's name occurs in this fragment of P. — but presumably more than once in *Demeter* — whence Theoc. 7.6 (Βούριναν plurr.: Βούρειαν codd. tres), Androm. *GDRK* 62.171 (Βούρινα TO: Βούριννα R) and in the Theocritean Σ (79.20 Wendel: Βουρινν‑ K: Βουρριν‑ cett., *ita fere* 81.25 Wendel, *al.*) and Eustath. on Dion. Per. 511 (II.314 Müller), *id. Comm. Il.* 309.2

---

[13] This is similar to e.g. Antim. fr. 83 Πύδητος κούρη τηλεκλειτοῦ ποταμοῖο where a metrical change necessitates a change of form in the traditional clausula *Il.* 14.321 = *Od.* 19.546 ~ [Hes.] *Scut.* 327 κούρης τηλεκλειτοῖο/, or to A.R. 1.1228 κρήνης . . . καλλινάοιο/ (καλλιρόου Σ ad loc., 111.24 Wendel) which varies Homeric *Od.* 17.206, *HHAp.* 122 κρήνη καλλίροος of which the singular genitive occurs in *HHAp.* 385 as κρήνης καλλιρόου.

(I.479 van der Valk; both times Βούριναν). The current form of the spring's name is secured by *IdC* ED 259 (1st cent. AD) [μὴ ἀντ]λῶντ[ω] | [τούτου] τοῦ ὕδα | [τος ἀ]πὸ Βου | [ρίννας] ἄχρι | [πόλι]ως (suppl. Segre). There may have been alternative spellings and Βύρινα may have been chosen here as a deliberate archaism. The Σ of Nicanor, the Coan commentator of P. who put forward an etymology Βου-ρινα which one can trust to be in accord with what stood in P.'s text, would be possible with the Βυρ- form too, which would originally be pronounced as Bour-, cf., similarly, Hes. fr. 296.3 Εὔβοιαν δὲ βοός μιν ἐπώνυμον ὠνόμασε Ζεύς.[14] Nicanor's Βούριναν would account for the corruption in the quotation of P.'s verse. The original form of the name would be Βύρινα. The formation is parallel to that of the toponym Μύρινα (a personal name in *Il.* 2.814, see von Kamptz 137, 310), which also comes up as Μούρινα due to its ancient pronunciation, see W. Ruge, *RE Suppl.* VI.615, Zgusta 411 (the form Μύριννα is Aeolic). A variation of o/u/ou vocals in non-Greek names is not uncommon, as it constituted "einen Versuch . . mit griechischen Mitteln einen fremden Vokal wiederzugeben, dessen Aussprache wohl zwischen o und u gelegen haben wird", A. Heubeck, *BzNF* 1 (1949), 278–9, cf. also R. Herbst, *RE* XVI.1.1093 s.v. Myrina, *id.*, *RE* XVII.1.763 for pre-Hellenic Νισούριος/Νισύριος. The Greeks did not understand those names and tried to explain them with arbitrary etymological devices, see Schwyzer i, 637–8. Later scholiasts of Theoc., who had little idea about Coan details (Wil. 1906, 152) thought that the name of the spring should be etymologised διὰ τοῦ βου ἐπιτατικοῦ and subsequently altered it into Βούρεια, as of βου + ῥέω. The true etymology of Bourina involves a pre-Hellenic stem *βουρ- or *βυρ- and the pre-Hellenic/Asia Minor suffix -ν-.[15]

---

[14] βούρινον 'a calf's snout' occurs in Ps-Apuleius *Herbarium* 86, an author dated by *LSJ* in the 4th cent. AD. The fountain Βουκεραΐς in Plataiai treated in Call. *Aet.* fr. 42 (< Theon fr. 5) is not a parallel case, as the two names are not etymologically connected.

[15] For the βουρ- stem cf. Βοῦρα, a daughter of Ion who gave her name to a town in the northern Peloponnese, Hdt. 1.145, Paus. 7.25.9, and an inscription Διὶ Βουριήνῳ near Amorion in central Asia Minor suggests a toponym *Βουριον, see Zgusta 127. Βοῦρον is attested in Iberia, Βύρινον in Mauritania, see for other Indo-european parallels Ch. Autran, *Introduction a l'étude critique du nom propre grec*, Paris 1930, 192–3. For pre-Hellenic -ινα cf. place-names such as Αἴγινα, Λάγινα (Caria) or Κύτινα (Thessaly) and in Asia Minor see the *Reverse Index* in Zgusta 684. On non-Greek names in the SE Aegean see Craik 47–50.

Fr. 7

G. Knaack, *Hermes* 23 (1888), 136 n. 1 and *Campbell wanted to ascribe this fragment to *Telephus*, in which some facets of the Jason-Medea story were treated on the grounds of *verbatim* repetition in A.R. 3.530 φάρμαχ' ὅσ' ἤπειρός τε φύει καὶ νήχυτον ὕδωρ/ in a passage dealing with Medea's magical powers. Cessi 1908, 137 ascribed it to *Demeter*: "de Burina fonte optime haec dici poterant". Demeter has strong links with Bourina and water probably played a role in *Demeter* as it seems to be converted to an image of programmatic significance along with other Philitan images in Call. *HyAp.* 110–2 and Theoc. 7.136f. There is at hand a reference to Bourina in fr. 6 and from Theoc. 7.6–7 and Σ ad loc. it appears that P. described the creation of this Coan spring. An abundant gush of water is a typical element in such scenes, cf. Antim. fr. 136.3 κρήνη γένετ' ἀενάουσα, Call. *HyJov.* 32 ἐκ δ' ἔχεεν μέγα χεῦμα, *id.* fr. 546, A.R. 4.1446 τὸ δ' ἀθρόον ἔβλυσεν ὕδωρ, *id.* 4.1148, Arat. 219–20 (Hippocrene) τὸ δ' ἀθρόον αὐτόθεν ὕδωρ/ἐξέχυτο, Q.S. 14.647 ἀνὰ δ' ἔβλυσεν ἄσπετον ὕδωρ, Orph. *Arg.* 598–600. The phrase might then originally come from the passage describing the appearance of Bourina. Nowacki 82 had linked this and fr. 6 as parts of a bucolic poem in a Coan locality. Bourina's waters and their connection with medicine would provide the necessary background for A.R.'s νήχυτον ὕδωρ used by Medea to produce magical drugs which are said to be able to prevent rivers from flowing (A.R. 3.532). The Philitan phrase might have once stood in a Σ on A.R. 3.530 whence Diogenianus > Hesychius picked it up and from a lexicon relying on him it migrated to the Etymologica > Suidas. That Apollonian Σ may go back to Theon (fr. *63).

7.a. νήχυτον is a Philitan coinage that established itself in the sense 'abundant'. It is formally coined on the one hand on the basis of Homeric νη- compounds such as νήδυμος etc. and on the other on Homeric -χυτος adjj., such as ἀμφίχυτος (B-P 524). Prefix νη- normally has a negative force (Chantraine *DE* s.v. ν-, νε-), but a Hellenistic interpretation, apparently originating in P., saw in it an intensive notion too, cf. Σ A.R. 3.530 (234.18 Wendel with *loc. sim.*) νήχυτον ὕδωρ· τὸ πολύχυτον· τὸ γὰρ νη- καὶ στέρησιν σημαίνει καὶ ἐπίτασιν, *ibid.* 4.1367 (315.7 Wendel). P. would apply his interpretation to Homeric passages too. Surprisingly, Aristarchus shared this view and understood νηλιτεῖς in *Od.* 16.317, *al.* as πολυαμάρτητοι, cf. also Σ *Od.*

1.380 (I.65 Dindorf) νήποινοι· πολύποινοι. Call. may have used νη- adjj. with both senses in *Hecale*, see A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 130 (2000), 16 (νήχυτος/νήκουστος). The idea is a derivative of the double power of other prefixes such as α-, which sometimes puzzled Hellenistic philologists, as with ἀξύλῳ in *Il.* 11.155, see Hainsworth, West ad loc. and in general Chantraine *DE* s.v. ἀ, ἁ. The intensifying force of ζα- as in ζαχρηής, ζάθεος etc. was, though, never set in doubt.

7.b. νήχυτον ὕδωρ The *iunctura* immediately appealed to learned poets: A.R. 3.530 νήχυτον ὕδωρ/ takes it up *verbatim* but applies it to sea-water, then Claud. *Gig.* 25 (a thirsty giant wants to drink νήχυτον ὕδωρ/), Musae. 247. Call. *Hec.* fr. 11 νήχυτος εὐρώς/ and Nic. *Alex.* 587 νήχυτον ἱδρῶ/ directly echo P., see further Livrea on A.R. 4.1367 νήχυτον ἄλμην/, Hollis on *Hec.* *l.c.* and in Imperial poetry Kost on Musae. 247. Variations of form are Nic. *Alex.* 174 ἀχύνετον .. ὕδωρ whence Dionys. Bass. *Fr. dub.* 82 λύσσαν ἀχύνετον, and Orph. *Arg.* 39 = 312 ἐπινήχυτα δῶρα/. Nonnus never uses νήχυτον, but emulates it in *D.* 19.346 Σιληνοῦ ζαχύτοιο, cf. 14.425, *al.* χυτὸν ὕδωρ/ ~ Opp. *Hal.* *1.413; the adj. might also lurk in *D.* 11.426 νήριθμον ὕδωρ, 48.602 νήδυμον ὕδωρ/. The incidences of this phrase in Hellenistic hexameters indicate its clausular position here too.

Fr. 8

This short and corrupt fragment is quoted by Athenaeus in order to illustrate θρήσασθαι as meaning 'sit down'. The fragment may be part of the Philitan response to *HHD* 98–101:

> ἕζετο δ' ἐγγὺς ὁδοῖο φίλον τετιημένη ἦτορ
> Παρθενίῳ φρέατι ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται
> ἐν σκιῇ, αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε πεφύκει θάμνος ἐλαίης,
> γρηῒ παλαιγενέει ἐναλίγκιος.

The olive-tree of Eleusis is replaced by the plane-tree of Cos. Note that in T. 23d.1 *visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra* Prop. imagines himself lying in the shade of a Heliconian tree close to Hippocrene. Features from the idyllic scenery with cool water and a shady plane-tree in Plato *Phdr.* 229af. (see Schönbeck 103f., Elliger 288f.) may have contributed to the imagery here. The Philitan quotation contains one element linking it to Demeter (θρήσασθαι) and another one linking it to Cos (πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο). θρήσασθαι refers to the notorious sitting down of mourning Demeter. It is a typical scene established

in *HHD* 98 and esp. 196–7, then cf. in poetry Pamphus *apud* Paus. 1.39.1 ἐποίησε δὲ Πάμφως ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ φρέατι (*sc.* the Ἄνθιον καλούμενον) καθῆσθαι Δήμητρα μετὰ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῆς παιδὸς γραΐ εἰκασμένην, Call. *Inc. sed.* fr. 611 with Pfeiffer ad loc. = [*Hec.*] fr. 172 Καλλιχόρῳ ἐπὶ φρητὶ καθέζεο παιδὸς ἄπυστος, *id. HyDem.* 15 τρὶς δ' ἐπὶ Καλλιχόρῳ χαμάδις ἐκαθίσσαο φρητί, Ov. *F.* 4.503 (*Agelastos Petra*) *hic primum sedit gelido maestissima saxo.* In P. the θρ- πλ- γρ- alliteration lively represents her movement.

Demeter's sitting down prescribes a practice in the Athenian Thesmophoria described by Plut. *Is. et Os.* 378d καὶ γὰρ Ἀθήνησι νηστεύουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν Θεσμοφορίοις χαμαὶ καθήμεναι. Contact with the ground is a sign of grief (cf. e.g. Achilleus in *Il.* 18.22–7 or Penelope in *Od.* 4.716–20) and the ritual in Athens imitates Demeter's grieving conduct in Eleusis.[16] A similar cult-practice in Cos would give rise to a tradition having the goddess sitting on Coan ground.

P. describes a hallowed idyllic setting. Philetas in Long. 2.3.5 says of his garden that notwithstanding its wall someone ἄλσος ὁρᾶν οἰήσεται. P.'s setting might partly reproduce real data so as to give it the value of an aetium. Plane-trees were the common constituents of sanctuaries (cf. Hdt. 5.119.2, Ach. Tat. 1.2.3, see Murr 12–5, Lembach 179–81), because they grew quickly, they were lofty, beautiful, long-living and provided ample shade. The sanctuary of Demeter in Lerna in Argolis was surrounded by plane-trees, Paus. 2.36.8, 37.1. The scenery would strongly resemble a precinct of Demeter, with plane-trees, a water source and a seated statue of Demeter in the Carnasian grove in Andania described in Paus. 4.33.4, cf. 9.39.2. Even a certain plane-tree (an old one near Bourina?) could be brought into association with Demeter (cf. Burkert 1985, 85–6). Plane-trees are nowadays believed to live for no longer than five hundred years but it was an ancient conviction that they are extremely long-lived, cf. Theophr. *HP* 4.13.2 with Amigues ad loc., 4.16.2, Gennadios 794 for similar Modern Greek beliefs.[17] Cos was an island rich in

---

[16] See Farnell iii, 94–5, Richardson 1974, 212, 351–2 and on v. 200, Parker 1983, 285 and on θρόνωσις as a prerequisite for initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries Burkert 1983, 266f.

[17] A current tradition holds that an imposing plane-tree of prodigious size called 'of Hippocrates' (because Hippocrates was allegedly tutoring under its shade) in the homonymous square of the modern town of Cos near the harbour is the biggest and most ancient in the world, see P-H xlviii, Gennadios 793, Sh-W 260–1.

timber, above all cypresses and plane-trees (Craik 18–9), and wood was a product liable to taxation, *LSCG* 168.6 (1st/2nd cent. BC).

Hermesian. T. 2.75–6 ἀοιδόν, ὃν . . ./Κῷοι χάλκειον θῆκαν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ is often brought into association with this fragment, but statues or effigies were commonly placed under trees to benefit from their shade (cf. Call. *HyDian.* 239, A.R. 1.1121, Moero *HE* 2.4). More pertinent may be the notion of the plane-tree as a traditional point of reflection, cf. Plato *Phdr.* 229a, Ar. *Nub.* 1008, Cic. *De orat.* 1.7.28, Anon. *EG* 829.2 Kaibel (2nd cent. AD). Hardie 27f. proposed to identify the plane-tree as the hallmark of the Coan Museum. *A. S. Hollis thought that Hermesianax's "apparent imitation . . . suggests that Philetas may have applied these words to himself" and related (cf. already Butler-Barber xlviii) a lover's common resort to the countryside, as Orpheus in Phanocl. *CA* 1.3–4 πολλάκι δὲ σκιεροῖσιν ἐν ἄλσεσιν ἕζετ' ἀείδων/ὃν πόθον or Acontius in Call. fr. 72. Nonetheless, one should enter the *caveat* here that Hermesianax's image of P. as lover may be a gross distortion. Philitan influence has also been suggested in Meleag. *HE* 13.7–8 ὄφρα φυγὼν τὸν Ἔρωτα μεσημβρινὸν ὕπνον ἀγρεύσω/ἐνθάδ' ὑπὸ σκιερᾷ κεκλιμένος πλατάνῳ where the learned Syrian uses a common motif.

8.a. {δέ} is transmitted after θρήσασθαι, but since the verse is surely the beginning of a hexameter, it rests unhappily there. There is no apparent reason for it to be a later insertion and it could hardly be a transposed Philitan word. *A. S. Hollis proposed to transpose it as a word of Athenaeus: "Suppose that the verb was originally exemplified in *two* quotations, of which the first has fallen out, so that the original text read ὡς <so and so in such and such a work καὶ> Φιλίτας δέ· θρήσασθαι — ὕπο" *cl.* e.g. Athen. 2.63a καὶ Ἀναξίλας δέ· followed by a quotation.

8.b. θρήσασθαι is an absolute hapax. Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 982.67 (III.631 van der Valk) ὅτι δὲ θρῆνυς ἀπὸ τοῦ θρῆσαι γίνεται, ὅ ἐστι καθίσαι etc. postulates a *θράω which prompted Maas to propose θρῆσαι δέ. "Bei Abtrennung eines νο- bzw. νυ- Suffixes ergibt sich Anschluß an den Aor. Inf. θρήσασθαι . . . gewöhnlich mit "sich setzen" wiedergegeben. Die ursprungliche Bedeutung muß aber vielmehr "sich aufstützen, aufstemmen" od. ähnl. gewesen sein, wenn das Wort, wie wahrscheinlich, zu derselben Sippe wie θρόνος gehört", noted Frisk s.v. θρᾶνος. P. might have picked it up from an Ionic dialect with the specific meaning 'sit down', probably on a surface

lower and less comfortable than that of a proper chair. Athenaeus apparently does not understand it very well and relies on a glossary to interpret it: θρήσασθαι . . . ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ καθέζεσθαι τάσσουσιν, ὡς Φιλίτας etc. With this rare gloss P. in a masterly fashion varies *HHD* 98 ἕζετο δ' ἐγγὺς ὁδοῖο etc., 197 ἔνθα καθεζομένη etc. Call. *HyDem.* 15 ἐκαθίσσαο faces the challenge by using a middle form occurring, as Hopkinson ad loc. noted, only once in Homer, the active being attested 32x. In fr. 611 he employs the banal καθέζεο.

8.c. πλατάνῳ Homer *Il.* 2.307, 310 knows only πλατάνιστος, cf. also Hdt. 5.119.2, *al.* By classical times (Ar., Plato) the only current form was πλάτανος. In Hellenistic poetry A.R. 2.733, Rhian. *HE* 10.1 use πλατάνιστος, Hermesian. *CA* 7.76, Nic. *Ther.* 584, Mosch. fr. 1.11, Meleag. *HE* 13.8 employ πλάτανος, Theoc. both (1x πλάτανος, 3x πλατάνιστος, see Gow on 18.44), Call. neither. In Imperial times the two forms coexist: Zonas *GPh* 3.1 πλάτανος, Thallus *GPh* 5.1, 5 πλατάνιστος, Nonn. *D.* 2x each form, Triph. 130 πλάτανος, Orph. *Arg.* 913 πλατάνιστος. The resurgence of the latter is due either to Homericisation or to poeticization, as in Alciphron 4.13.4. The tree derives its name from its broad leaves, cf. Theophr. *CP* 1.10.4.

8.d. πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο O. Schneider, *Philologus* 6 (1851), 523 n. 18, cf. *id.* 1873, 669 corrected the MSS' γαίῃ to γραίῃ. γραῖα first appears as a noun in *Od.* 1.439 but γέρων is used as an adj. applied to inanimate objects in *Od.* 22.184 σάκος . . γέρον, see Gow on Theoc. 7.17 γέρων . . πέπλος, and in Aesch. *Ag.* 295 γραίας ἐρείκης > Soph. fr. 868 γραίας ἀκάνθης it characterises a tree, cf. further Arat. 921 πάπποι, λευκῆς ('old') γήρειον ἀκάνθης. Unger had earlier proposed λασίῃ ὕπο which found sympathy with Bach 56 and Thomas 41 n. 18 on the strength of Anon. *FGE* 74.6 λασίας θάμνῳ ὕπο πλατάνου (when applied to trees λάσιος mostly refers to oaks, see Bornmann on Call. *HyDian.* 192). O. Schneider's γραίῃ gains in probability from two further considerations: first, it may be an echo of the inverted order of *HHD* 101 (Demeter) γρηὶ παλαιγενέει (ἐναλίγκιος). Secondly, γραίῃ tallies with the notion of the plane-tree's longevity. This would be an important detail, if the line has an aetiological character.

Fr. 9

This is a fragment of lamenting character in which (apparently) Demeter expresses self-pity about her present troubles, which are

presumably contrasted to her previous happiness or her potential happiness should Persephone be with her. The lines recall tragic statements of desperation cf. e.g. Eur. *Aeolus* fr. 35 Kannicht αἰεὶ τὸ μὲν ζῇ, τὸ δὲ μεθίσταται κακόν,/τὸ δ' ἐκπέφηνεν αὖθις ἐξ ἀρχῆς νέον. Noteworthy is the metaphorical language employed by Demeter on Homeric grounds, which alludes to the digesting of food for fasting Demeter and growth of crops at a time in which the goddess is hindering it. Means such as this, creating a sardonic effect, might have been a recurrent feature in the lamentation of Demeter. The reception of this passage in A.R. (see nn. 1b, e) is indicative of the interest these lines elicited. Pohlenz 34–5 interpreted it as "wäre ich ein Mensch, dann könnte ich mich ausweinen. So ist Leid unsterblich, wie ich selbst", but this may be inspired by passages such as Ov. *F.* 4.520 (Demeter to a daughter of Celeus) *heu, melior quanto sors tua sorte mea est* and in fact lacks positive evidence or parallel.

9.1a. νῦν δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος, Hsch. ν 729, see *LSJ* s.v. νῦν I.4, K-G ii, 117 n. 2. νῦν δέ is used after an unreal hypothesis or wish or a real situation in the past and takes one back to a usually unhappy reality. It is very often used in Homer, cf. of personal grief *Il.* 1.417, *Il.* 9.344, 356 (Achilleus' νῦν δ', see Edwards on *Il.* 18.88), *Od.* 1.219, 8.182 νῦν δ' ἔχομαι κακότητι καὶ ἄλγεσι ~ 17.318, *Od.* 18.256 = 19.129 νῦν δ' ἄχομαι, and in tragedy with a rhetorical colour mostly in *rheseis*, cf. e.g. [Aesch.] *Prom.* 158, Soph. *OC* 905, *Phil.* 949, Eur. *Or.* 504, 1134, *Med.* 16 (on which C. W. Willink, *CQ* n.s. 38 (1988), 317), fr. 636.6, Theodect. *TrGF* 72 F 8.6, never in choral lyrics except Eur. *Hel.* 1161 where the formula νῦν δ' οἱ μὲν . . ./. . . τείχεα δέ is evidently influenced by the rhetoric of the funerary epigram. Its frequency in tragedy is due to the fact that such contrasts tend to come up on occasions of desperation, cf. the Argonauts in A.R. 4.1256 and Ancaeus in 4.1270. In funerary epigrams νῦν δέ usually distinguishes between the status while the deceased was still in life and his present one, cf. the seminal *Il.* 19.289, 319 and *AP* 7.211, 271, 538, 670 etc. (see Lattimore 172–7, Alexiou 165–71), whence transferred to the erotic field in Asclep. *HE* 19.1.

9.1b. πέσσω Attic πέττω, πέπτω, see fr. 13.1e. The verse is modelled on two passages employing πέσσω in a metaphorical and in a literary way, *Il.* 24.639 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ στενάχω καὶ κήδεα μυρία πέσσω and *Od.* 7.118–9 ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἰεί/ζεφυρίη πνείουσα τὰ μὲν φύει, ἄλλα δὲ πέσσει, in which the antithesis αἰεί/. . . τὰ μὲν φύει, ἄλλα δὲ πέσσει

is reflected in αἰεὶ πέσσω, τὸ δ' ἀέξεται ἄλλο. It is then echoed *in oppositione* in A.R. 1.283–4 (Alcimede) ἄλλα δὲ πάντα πάλαι θρεπτήρια πέσσω./νῦν γε μέν etc. The literary meaning of the verb is 'digest' and the point here (and in fr. 13.1) is ironic, as Demeter abstains from food. The absolute use of the verb is an innovation. The absence of an object effects a vagueness to suggest that here Demeter digests grief instead of food, cf. πῆμα in the next line. For this ambivalent use of πέσσω cf. the following ἀέξεται, προσαυξάνεται in fr. 10.4, further ἔλλαχε in fr. 13.2.

9.1c. (τὸ δ') ἀέξεται occurs here in its usual *sedes* in epic, cf. *Il.* 9.66, Hes. *Theog.* 195, *WD* 377, *HHD* 235, 300, *al.*, see *LFrE* s.v. ἀέξω. In Hellenistic poetry cf. Call. *HyDian.* 131, A.R. 2.45, 878, Moero *CA* 1.2, Antig. Car. *SH* 47.2, Nic. *Ther.* 544, Maiist. *Aret.* 34 (*CA*, 70) and similarly Theoc. 15.21. Never so in Aratus (4x).

9.1d. ἀέξεται . . ./πῆμα is another bold metaphor. The irony of πέσσω extends to ἀέξεται, which alludes to the non-growing crops during Demeter's famine, cf. *HHD* 469 (Rhea to Demeter) α[ἶψα δὲ κα]ρπὸν ἄεξε φερέσβιον ἀνθρώποισιν. What grow instead are Demeter's sufferings. The closest parallels are *Il.* 17.139 ~ *Od.* 17.489 μέγα πένθος . . ἀέξων ~ *GVICyr* 5.13 (2nd cent. BC), Nonn. *D.* 26.154 and Anon. *AP* 7.334.16, Theogn. 1031 ἄλγος ἀέξων ~ *GVI* 1920.5 (1st cent. AD) and Nonn. *D.* 19.34, A.R. 3.837 (ἄχεα) ἔμελλεν ἀεξήσεσθαι ὀπίσσω, Q.S. 1.23, 116, *al.*, 9.383 ἕλκος ἀέξετο, Nonn. *D.* 12.269 ἀεξομένης . . . ἀνίης, 304 ὠδῖνας ἀέξων (Dionysus in the scene of Ampelos' death, reproducing the same ambiguity as in P.). With the metaphor cf. the elegiac epitaph in G. B. D'Alessio, *ZPE* 106 (1995), 22f. (Arta, 6th cent. BC) v. 6 πένθος ἔθαλλε, Soph. fr. 441a.11 ἐπὶ μέγα τόδε φλ[ύει κα]κόν (suppl. Barrett), Eur. *Alc.* 1085 ἡβάσκει κακόν, Hdt. 3.62.4, 5.92.δ κακὰ ἀναβλαστεῖν, Androm. *GDRK* 62.84 (to gain sharper sight snakes eat fennel) πιαῖνον . . ἄλγεα βουπελάταις. The phrase contributes to the remarkably descriptive language of the fragment.

9.1e. ἄλλο νεῶρες/πῆμα is most closely paralleled with A.R. 2.137–8 ἄλλο/πῆμ' αἴδηλον, cf. also [Aesch.] *Prom.* 1074–75 ἀπρόοπτον/πῆμ', *Il.* 21.39 ἀνώϊστον κακόν, Simon. *PMG* 527.1–2 κακόν/ἀνεπιδόκητον, Arat. 768 ἀπρόφατον κακόν. ἄλλο is often used in expressions denoting a succession of misfortunes in a sense coming close to 'additional', as *Il.* 18.435, *Od.* 5.179 = 10.300 πῆμα κακὸν . . ἄλλο, Hes. *Theog.* 800, Aesch. *Ag.* 865, Eur. *Med.* 705, *Hipp.* 874, *Hec.* 233, A.R.

2.223, 3.910, 3.1081, Q.S. 9.94–5 ~ Nonn. *D.* 21.91 κακώτερον . . ἄλλο/πῆμα, cf. the examples from late Greek epic in Campbell on Q.S. 12.487 and see Dover on Ar. *Ran.* 515 on a similar nuance of ἕτερος.

9.1f. νεῶρες 'sudden, unexpected' rather than 'new' (*LSJ* s.v.). It is a *vox tragica*, cf. Soph. *El.* 901, *OC* 730 φόβον νεώρη, *Ichn.* 160, Eur. *Antiope* fr. 48.6 Kambitsis, *q.v.* (fr. 5.6 Diggle) Δί]ρκης νεῶρες αἷμα, fr. 964.6, but here it is rather a tragic vest on an epic body. ὄρνυμι is freely used in early epic of persons, things and abstract meanings (κακόν, μένος, φόβον, στόνον, σθένος, etc.), but never with πῆμα as subject or object. νεῶρες creates an image of a calamity suddenly rising before the inflicted as a wave, cf. *Il.* 11.658 πένθεος, ὅσσον ὄρωρε, *Od.* 7.270–1 ξυνέσεσθαι ὀιζυῖ/πολλῇ, τήν μοι ἐπῶρσε Ποσειδάων (particularly appropriate as the ὀιζύς is a storm in the sea), Aesch. *Ag.* 346–7 ἐγρηγορὸς τὸ πῆμα . . ./γένοιτ' ἄν, Pind. *P.* 4.155 μή τι νεώτερον . . . ἀναστάῃ κακόν, Q.S. 13.254 σφίσι πῆμα κόρυσσε/ ~ 6.601 = 8.227 ~ Opp. *Hal.* 5.77.

9.2a. πῆμα, κακοῦ are here juxtaposed but belong to different syntactical units. Epic often conjoins the two words, as in *Od.* 3.152 πῆμα κακοῖο, 5.179, *al.* πῆμα κακόν, 7.195 κακὸν καὶ πῆμα, Lyc. 613 κακῶν τε πημάτων παραίτιον. πῆμα is the specific or separate misfortune, κακόν the general plight in which Demeter finds herself.

9.2b. οὔ πω 'not at all', see J. G. Fontenrose, *AJPh* 62 (1940), 65–79, West on Hes. *Theog.* 560, Janko on *Il.* 15.426–8 and cf. fr. 3.2.

9.2c. γίνεται Most MSS in Homer have this old Ionic form instead of γίγνομαι and inscriptions provide evidence that it prevailed later, see West on Hes. *Theog.* 429, Campbell on Q.S. 12.2, Allen on Mimn. fr. 1.4.

9.2d. κακοῦ . . . ἡσυχίη sounds prosaic, cf. Hdt. 6.135.2 ἡσυχίη ('respite, release') τῆς πολιορκίης, Plato *Rep.* 583e ἡσυχίη τῆς ἡδονῆς, in poetry Pind. *N.* 1.70 ἡσυχίαν καμάτων μεγάλων. The repertoire of nouns with κακοῦ (-ῶν) is rich: *Il.* 2.380 ἀνάβλησις κακοῦ, *Il.* 9.250 ~ *Od.* 22.481 κακοῦ . . ἄκος ~ Aesch. *Pers.* 631, *Od.* 12.120 οὐδέ τις ἔστ' ἀλκή (*sc.* ἀθανάτου κακοῦ, of Charybdis), Hes. *Theog.* 876 ~ *WD* 201 κακοῦ δ' οὐ γίνεται ἀλκή, *Carm. Aur.* 56 ~ Ps-Phoc. 120 λύσιν . . κακῶν ~ Hdt. 6.139.1, Eur. *Andr.* 535–6 κακῶν/μῆχος ~ Hdt. 2.181.4, 4.151.2, Adesp. *TrGF* 430a γένοιτο παῦλα . . κακῶν with Th. K. Stephanopoulos, *ZPE* 83 (1988), 231–2, Men. *Mon.* fr. 14.2

ἀνάπαυσις . . τῶν κακῶν, Q.S. 9.15 κακοῦ δ' οὐ γίνετ' ἐρωή, Orph. *Arg.* 893 κακῶν . . . πυθμήν. This Philitan expression is often paralleled with Mimnermus *IEG* 12.2 οὐδέ ποτ' ἄμπαυσις γίνεται οὐδεμία, but such an approach is not favoured by the context in Mimn. and similar expressions are frequent in epic, e.g. *Il.* 4.245 οὐδ' ἄρα τίς σφι . . . γίνεται ἀλκή, *Il.* 21.528–9 οὐδέ τις ἀλκή/γίνεθ', *Od.* 21.305, etc.

9.2e. ἡσυχίη ἡσυχίη's philosophical implications (cf. Plato *Rep.* 583e, see Pohlenz 27–9) should be kept apart from this passage. The term is mostly prosaic and so is its use here. It is a Homeric hapax, *Od.* 18.22 ('rest'), then as 'rest, peace of soul, tranquillity' in *HHHerm.* 356, Archil. *IEG* 196a.16, Theogn. 48, etc. The word's occurrence at the end of a pentameter is common.

Fr. 10

This fragment has been attributed to all three titled works of P. (Stob. *S* Φιλῆτα). Cessi 1914, 286–7 suggested that these verses may be the words of Telephus to Clytemnestra in order to win her sympathy and may therefore belong to *Telephus.* Couat 78 deemed that here P. "laments his own ill-luck". Nowacki 64–5, for whom *Hermes* consisted of both hexameters and pentameters, believed that these lines were delivered by Odysseus in *Hermes.* Bergk took these verses to be part of *Demeter* in relation to frr. 9 and 13 (cf. Wil. 1924 ii, 115 n. 3) and Cessi 1908, 137 initially considered them as the words of Celeus to Demeter when she called him a happy man. Demeter would recount to her Coan hosts her troubles with Persephone. It seems that this happened in a very emotional speech which could have led Demeter to tears (fr. 12) and prompted Chalcon to a consolatory response (fr. 13). μοί in v. 1 may be used to assert Demeter's authority over the vegetation of land. γαίης ὕπερ ἠδὲ θαλάσσης seems to depend on ἐρχομένων to aknowledge Zeus' authority over land and sea. It seems less likely that it depends on a verb describing the wanderings of Demeter over land and sea as in *HHD* 43 σεύατο . . . ἐπὶ τραφερὴν καὶ ὑγρήν.[18] ὡραίων may hint at seasons timely, but fruit-

[18] Cf. then Ov. *Met.* 6.438–9 *interea pavidae nequiquam filia matri/omnibus est terris, omni quaesita profundo, ibid.* 6.642–3, Ael. Arist. *Eleus.* 3 (poets etc. tell) Δήμητρα δ' ἐπέρχεσθαι γῆν πᾶσαν καὶ θάλατταν ζητοῦσαν τὴν θυγατέρα, further Eur. *Hel.* 1302–07 ~ Carcin. II *TrGF* 70 F 5, Ant. Lib. 24.1 (< Nic. *Heter.*) πλανῆτις ἐπῄει γῆν ἅπασαν, Call. *HyDem.* 9–16, Ov. *F.* 4.574 and the detailed geographical account in 4.467f., 497f., 563f.

less. Moira, as a deity traditionally with superior power to that of Zeus (Erbse 1986, 284–93, Janko 4–7), may be invoked as a last bid for a solution; but to no avail: in all versions she stands on the side of Zeus. μελέῳ can be either masculine or feminine and may refer to Demeter. ἔμπεδ(α) may hint at Persephone's current abode. The verses that seem to be missing between 2 and 3 would cast more light on the interpretation of this fragment. The wording of the fragment (esp. μοι, ὡραίων . . . ἐτέων) and the crop-metaphor with προσαυξάνεται might, though, suggest that Demeter referred to the famine she imposed on human race. It is noteworthy that Demeter's innocent complaint is expressed in highly allusive language.

10.1a. τῶ οὔ μοι Many efforts have been made to replace this with the verb that we need in the first two verses. Still, in a highly emotional passage one would expect an accumulation of negative statements on what Demeter, who apparently talks, cannot accomplish, as in e.g. Q.S. 7.64–5 (Podalirius of the death of his brother Machaon) τῶ μοι πένθος ἄλαστον ἐποίχεται· οὐδ' ἔτι κείνου/τεθναότος φάος ἐσθλὸν ἐέλδομαι εἰσοράασθαι. Wil. 1924 ii, 115 n. 3 and Diehl ad loc. ("ego omnia recte se habere puto") were probably right in defending the tradition. The hiatus creates no difficulties, cf. *Il.* 2.250, 14.126, *al.*, A.R. 1.334 and see M. Campbell in Fantuzzi-Pretagostini i, 195. For the juxtaposition with the personal pronoun cf. *Il.* 14.126 /τῶ οὐκ ἄν με, *Il.* 4.410 /τῶ μή μοι ~ Arat. 413, *Od.* 13.5 τῶ σ' οὔ τι, A.R. 2.15 /τῶ καί μοι, 3.978 τῶ μή με λίην, Arat. 379 τῶ καὶ . . οἱ ~ Q.S. 13.255, Pind. *P.* 5.23 τῶ σε μή. τῶ suggests that Demeter gave a reason for her endless sufferings and an explicit reference to Zeus' responsibility might have preceded. Chalcon in fr. 13.1 might be taking up that point rather than the one in v. 2. On the orthography of τῶ see Chantraine *GH* i, 248–9, Kidd on Arat. 14, West, ed. *Il.* i, xxii (printing τώ).

10.1b. πολέων . . ./. . . ἐτέων πολέων (Attic πολλῶν) is an epic form (also used in lyrics in drama, Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 1332). The gap between πολέων and the rest of the construction does not necessitate emendation. The genitive absolute is a strong and independent structure and enjoys an increased degree of liberty, which permits it to maintain its coherence even if its elements are scattered in the text. The Hellenistic poets in particular created more complex structures with absolute genitives than did their predecessors, see G. Vasilaros, *Der Gebrauch des Genitivus Absolutus bei Apollonius Rhodius im Verhältnis zu*

Homer, Athens 1993, esp. his conclusions pp. 251–7 and his discussion on temporal absolute genitives pp. 219f. However, if Demeter is expressing her desperation, Emperius' spondaic πλεῖον would deserve consideration (for such rhythm in similar contexts in P. cf. fr. 9.1, fr. 23.1, 3).

10.1c. γαίης ὕπερ ἠδὲ θαλάσσης Cf. *HH* 15.4 κατὰ γαῖαν . . ἠδὲ θάλασσαν, [Mosch.] *Megara* 43 ἐπὶ γαῖαν . . ἠδὲ θάλασσαν, based on *Il.* 14.408 = *Od.* 20.98 = *HHD* 43 ἐπὶ τραφερήν τε καὶ ὑγρήν, *HHD* 69 πᾶσαν ἐπὶ χθόνα καὶ κατὰ πόντον ~ Aesch. *Ag.* 576, *Il.* 24.341–2, *al.* ἠμὲν ἐφ' ὑγρὴν/ἠδ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν. γαίης ὕπερ is rare; it occurs in A.R. *4.1271 = Opp. *Hal.* *1.37, then *Il.* 13.200 = Hes. *WD* 551 = A.R. 4.1426 γαίης ὕπερ, cf. *Il.* 23.327 ὑπὲρ αἴης/ ~ Arat. 554. The clausula ἠδὲ θαλάσσ(ης)/ is common. Cf. Theoc. *17.76 γαίας . . . θαλάσσας, Q.S. *5.7.

10.2a. ἐκ Διός The phrase often stands at the beginning of a hexameter or pentameter in the emphatic runover position, such as *Il.* 2.33, 70, *al.*, *Od.* 1.283, Hes. *Theog.* 96 /ἐκ δὲ Διός whence Call. *HyJov.* 79 (cf. [Hes.] *Scut.* 197 /ἐν δὲ Διός), Theoc. 26.31, Arat. 743, Cleanth. *CA* 1.4 /ἐκ σοῦ (*sc.* Διός), Mosch. *Eur.* 15, Diot. *HE* 1.4 (pentam.), Q.S. 2.223, 8.223, Triph. 227, Nonn. *D.* 21.334, *al.* Cf. after a pentameter caesura Ion *IEG* 27.6, conversely Marc. Arg. *AP* 9.246.4 /οὐ Διὸς ἐκ χειρῶν, ἀλλά etc., never in A.R. The phrase often serves as an *exordium* in poems such as Alcm. *PMGF* 29, Theoc. 17.1 with Gow ad loc., Arat. 1, Strato *AP* 12.1.1, see M. Fantuzzi, *MD* 5 (1980), 163–72.

10.2b. ἐκ Διὸς ὡραίων ἐρχομένων ἐτέων Zeus is primarily the sky-god, cf. *Il.* 15.192 and see West on Hes. *WD* 416, Burkert 1985, 126. The idea that years, seasons, days and nights come from him is Homeric, cf. *Il.* 2.134 ἐννέα . . . Διὸς μεγάλου ἐνιαυτοί, *Od.* 14.93 ὅσσαι γὰρ νύκτες τε καὶ ἡμέραι ἐκ Διός εἰσιν ~ [Mosch.] *Megara* 46 νύκτας τε κλαίουσα καὶ ἐκ Διὸς ἤμαθ' ὁπόσσα with Th. Breitenstein, *Recherches sur le poème Mégara*, Copenhagen 1966, 50, then Alcm. *PMGF* 20.1 (Zeus?) ὥρας δ' ἔσηκε τρεῖς, Soph. *Ant.* 607 ἀκάματοι θεῶν (= Διός, see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 182, pp. 110–1) μῆνες, Plato *Prot.* 321a τὰς ἐκ Διὸς ὥρας, A.R. 1.1071 ἐκ Διὸς ἦμαρ ἐπήλυθεν and see Hainsworth on *Il.* 11.84–5 *ad fin.* on ἱερὸν ἦμαρ, κνέφας ἱερόν. Zeus brings about the suitable season for each agricultural work (Arat. 743 ἐκ Διὸς ἤδη πάντα πεφασμένα πάντοθι κεῖται) but in Call. *HyDem.* 122–3 λευκὸν ἔαρ, λευκὸν δὲ θέρος καὶ χεῖμα φέροισα/ἡξεῖ καὶ

φθινόπωρον, ἔτος δ' εἰς ἄλλο φυλαξεῖ and in Adaeus *GPh* 2.6 it is Demeter who brings fruitful seasons. The point here may be that Zeus' acknowledged authority to marshal the seasons is insufficient to produce crops without Demeter's consent. In Lyc. 620f. Diomedes' curse has a similar effect: εὐχὰς ἀρούραις ἀμφ' ἐτητύμους βαλεῖ,/Δηοῦς ἀνεῖναι μήποτ' ὄμπνιον στάχυν,/γύας τιθαιβώσσοντος ἀρδηθμῷ Διός,/ἣν μή etc.

10.2c. ὡραίων . . ἐτέων was taken up by Theoc. 7.85 ἔτος ὥριον ~ [25].28 θέρος ὥριον, further Theophr. *De odor.* 68 ἐν ταῖς ἐτείαις ὥραις, Cratin. *PCG* 9.1–2 ἀμφιετηριζομέναις/ὥραις. ἔτος ὥριον in Theoc. seems to be equivalent to 'spring'.[19] The Σ (101.14 Wendel) note: ὥριον: τινὲς τὸν ὅλον ἐνιαυτόν. δύναται δὲ καὶ οὕτως (KUEA: οὗτος LP) οὐ πάντως τὸ δωδεκάμηνον λέγειν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν ὡρῶν μεταβολήν· διαιρεῖται γὰρ εἰς δ'. τὸ γοῦν ἔαρ ὁ Θεόκριτος ὥριον εἶπεν (γοῦν may suggest a lost, more detailed argumentation). Gow ad loc. cited examples where a noun's meaning is restricted by the adj. applied to it, such as *Od.* 17.606 δείελον ἦμαρ ~ [Theoc.] 25.86, A.R. 3.41, A.R. 1.450 σταθερὸν ἦμαρ, Hor. *Epod.* 3.29 *annus hibernus* (= winter), *C.* 3.23.8 *pomifero . . . anno* (= autumn), Virg. *A.* 6.311 *frigidus annus.* The traditional view since Kayser 54 regards ὡραίων as "epitheton ornans τῶν ἐτέων, quatenus ἔτεα continent ὥρας, nihil amplius" as in *HHD* 265 ὥρῃσιν . . . περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν and elsewhere. This misses an important point. ὥρη is a term closely associated with vegetation (Erbse 1986, 41) and as such it is related to Demeter, who in *HHD* 54, 192, 492 is ὡρηφόρος ("bringer of ripeness", Richardson on v. 54), ὡρία in a coin from Smyrna (Farnell iii, 318 n. 33) and can bring fruitful seasons (see n. 2b). ὡραῖος 'opportune, at its best' applies to the maturity of crops (and animals, even women), cf. Hes. *WD* 31f., Plato *Crat.* 410c ὧραι γάρ εἰσι διὰ τὸ ὁρίζειν . . . καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, Hsch. ω 398 ὡραίων· τῶν καρπῶν. At the same time, ὡραῖος can simply mean 'timely', as in Hes. *WD* 392–4 ὥρια . . ./ἔργα κομίζεσθαι Δημήτερος, ὥς . . ./ὥρι' ἀέξηται, Hdt. 4.28.2 τὴν μὲν ὡραίην ('natural season for rain') οὐκ ὕει ἄξιον οὐδέν, Arat. 1075–76 χαίρει καὶ γεράνων ἀγέλαις ὡραῖος ἀροτρεύς/ὥριον

[19] ἔτος cannot mean anything else than 'year', see C. J. Emlyn-Jones, "ἔτος and ἐνιαυτός in Homeric formulae", *Glotta* 45 (1967), 156–61 with R. S. P. Beekes, *Glotta* 47 (1969), 138–42, see also *LFrE* s.v., S. West on *Od.* 1.16 and cf. Plato *Crat.* 410c ἐνιαυτὸς δὲ καὶ ἔτος κινδυνεύει ἕν τι εἶναι.

ἐρχομέναις, or Anyte *HE* 16.2 ὡραίου . . . νάματος ἀδὺ πόμα i.e. coming up at the right moment for the wayfarer. The phrase seems to play upon the ambiguity 'timely/fertile seasons'. Demeter perhaps implies that though Zeus' authority will grant an undisturbed succession of seasons, her own authority will keep them infertile.

10.2d. ἐρχομένων ἐτέων Cf. Arat. 373 /ἀνομένων ἐτέων, A.R. 1.688 τελλομένου ἔτεος, 1.690 ἐπερχόμενον . . . εἰς ἔτος and Arat. 938 πολλάκι δ' ἐρχομένων ὑετῶν. The phrase provides a novel appearance to the Homeric formula ἔτος ἦλθεν, *Od.* 1.16, 2.107, *al.*, which never occurs in the genitive absolute. It is modelled on similar Homeric absolute genitives such as *Il.* 2.551 περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν, *Od.* 1.16 ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν ~ 11.248, see Vasilaros (as in n. 1b), 92–3. In the second verse the choice of words creates a succession of ο/ε sounds: *ὡραίων ἐρχομένων ἐτέων*, as in Hdt. 1.26.1 Κροῖσος ὁ Ἀλυάττεω *ἐτέων ἐών* etc.

If, as it seems, οὐ in 1 must be retained, οὐδ' in 3 is meaningless unless a verb lies between the two negatives. For reasons of content οὐδ' in 3 most probably introduces a new paratactical clause governed by ἀπὸ . . φέρει. The emendation of πολέων into πολέω by Grotius presupposes an additional emendation of (τῶ) οὔ μοι into something else. The verb sounds awkward with γαίης ὕπερ ἠδὲ θαλάσσης and seems incompatible with the second verse of the fragment. Wil. 1924 ii, 115 n. 3 justified the two negatives through means usually applied to dramatic texts, "durch die Erregung des Redenden . . . auch durch das lange Zwischenglied" and considered οὐκ for οὐδ' in 3. He also "necessarily" ("notwendig", and therefore, it seems, half-heartedly) connected μοί in 1 with μελέῳ in 3. One feels more comfortable about postulating a lacuna of two or more verses, which would specifically refer to *Demeter*, not offering a point of general interest, and therefore omitted by an anthologist. Both the content of the fragment and οὐδ' indicate that Demeter in a sentimental outbreak deplored her misfortunes with a succession of two or three negative statements concluded with a final ἀλλά-clause. This would create a rhetorical effect which is common in epic.[20]

---

[20] Cf. *Il.* 1.152–8, 4.223–5 ἔνθ' οὐκ ἂν βρίζοντα ἴδοις Ἀγαμέμνονα δῖον/οὐδὲ καταπτώσσοντ' οὐδ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα μάχεσθαι,/ἀλλὰ μάλα σπεύδοντα etc., *Il.* 13.712–6, *Od.* 4.566–7, 6.43f. and on three negations in similes see Edwards 28–9, Hes. *Theog.* 423–5, Archil. *IEG* 128, A.R. 1.644–8, 4.1776–79 οὔ νύ τις ὔμμιν ἄεθλος/. . . ./οὔτ' ἀνέμων ἐριῶλαι . . ἀλλὰ ἔκηλοι etc., Call. *HyDel.* 302–3, Phoen. *CA* 5.5–10, [Mosch.] *EB* 20–2, etc.

10.3a. Μοῖρα Singular, as always in Homer except *Il.* 24.49. In later versions Moirai often come up in connection with Persephone's abduction or play a role as Zeus' emissaries, cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.532 *nam sic Parcarum foedere cautum est.* In Claud. *RP* 1.217f. Atropos compels Zeus to indulge in Persephone's rape, see Gruzelier on 1.214f., 218f. In 3.410–1 Demeter herself complains about Moira: *sic numina fatis/volvimur et nullo Lachesis discrimine saevit.* In Nonn. *D.* 6.94 εἰ λίνα Μοιράων ἐπιπείθεται assent of Moirai is a prerequisite for Core's rape, cf. Orph. *Arg.* 1195, Orph. *Hy.* 43.7f., see Richardson 1974, 83. In Phigalia the Moirai persuaded Demeter to lay her wrath aside, Paus. 8.42.3, cf. Claud. *RP* 1.487f.

10.3b. κακῶν μελέῳ The one MS of Stobaeus preserving this fragment offers μελέω κακῶν and Passow inverted the sequence of the words to restore metrical order. The text may be badly corrupt or we may simply have to do with a mistake of *simplex ordo.* When ἀποφέρω, as usual (always in Homer, Chantraine *GH* ii, 92–3), takes a concrete object, it governs an accusative, but a genitive of separation would be possible with an abstract object. Von Blumenthal's 2168 κακῶν μελεδῶ is possible, cf. [Aesch.] *Prom.* 26 ἀχθηδὼν κακοῦ, Eur. *Suppl.* 807 ~ Arat. 126 ἄλγη κακῶν, but is unattractive in this context evoking Moira. It would allude to Demeter traditionally wasting herself away, cf. *HHD* 94, 201 ἧστο πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός with Richardson ad loc. In Nonn. *D.* 6.30–1 πιεῖν δ' ἠρνήσατο Δηώ/Περσεφόνης μεθύουσα μεληδόνι.

10.3c. ἀλλὰ . . /. . . ἄλλα may be an intentional word-play. Cf. Homeric *Il.* 9.45, *al.* ἀλλ' ἄλλοι, *Od.* 7.118–9, 8.169–70 ἄλλος . . . εἶδος ἀκιδνότερος πέλει ἀνήρ/ἀλλὰ θεὸς μορφὴν ἔπεσι στέφει ~ 8.174–5, Archil. *IEG* 25.5 οὔτις ἄλλ]ος μάντις ἀλλ' ἐγώ, and in Hellenistic verse Call. *HyJov.* 72–3, *HyDel.* 165–6 ἀλλά οἱ . . . τις ὀφειλόμενος θεὸς ἄλλος/ἐστί, *HE* 2.5–6 ἀλλὰ . . ./. . . Ἠχώ φησί τις· 'ἄλλος ἔχει', A.R. 1.97–9 οὐ μὲν ἔτ' ἄλλους/. . υἷας ἔχεν . . ./ἀλλά ἑ τηλύγετον, 1.894 ἄλλων ἐκ πόλιων. ἀλλ' οὐ σύ γε etc., 2.1049–50 ἀλλά τιν' ἄλλην/μῆτιν πορσύνωμεν, 4.743–4, Theoc. 7.91–4 πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα/Νύμφαι κἠμὲ δίδαξαν . . ./ἐσθλά . . ./ἀλλὰ τόγ' ἐκ πάντων μέγ' ὑπείροχον, 1.36–7, 4.17–9, Phoen. *CA* 1.9–10, Antip. Sid. *HE* 8.4–5 οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἄλλᾳ/ἱερὸν ἀλλ' ἐν ἐμοί, Argent. *GPh* 7 ἄλλος ὁ Μηνοφίλας . . ./ ἄλλος . . ./ἀλλ' ἴτε etc., cf. in Modern Greek poetry Od. Elytis, *Τὰ Ἐλεγεῖα τῆς Ὀξώπετρας*, "Ῥῆμα τὸ σκοτεινόν": Αὐτὰ στὴ γλῶσσα τὴ δική μου. Κι ἄλλοι ἄλλα σ' ἄλλες. Ἀλλ'/ἡ ἀλήθεια μόνον ἔναντι θανάτου δίδεται. For such juxtaposition of cognates cf. Arat. 779–80

ἄλλοτε γάρ τ' ἄλλῃ . . ./ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖαι, then e.g. Plato *Gorg.* 448c μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἄλλοι ἄλλων ἄλλως, Luc. *Lex.* 5 ἄλλος ἄλλοσε ἄλλα ἐδρῶμεν, further A.R. 1.90–1 οὐ μὲν ἅμ' ἄμφω/οὐδ' ὁμόθεν, 2.28, *al.* οἰόθεν οἶος or *id.* 3.192 πάντες ἐπεὶ πάντῃ with Campbell ad loc.

10.3d. μένουσιν/ἔμπεδ' ἀεί Cf. A.R. 3.772–3 οὐδέ τις ἀλκή/πήματος, ἀλλ' αὔτως φλέγει ἔμπεδον and for the wording Orph. *Arg.* 710 (Blue Rocks) βυσσόθεν ἐρριζοῦντο καὶ ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἔμιμνον. The emendations of Grotius and Meineke are certain. The construction is a medley of two Homeric phrases, μένον ἔμπεδον (*Il.* 5.527 = 17.434 = *Od.* 11.152, *al.*, cf. also Aesch. *Ag.* 854, oracle in Hdt. 7.140.1 = 14.3 P-W, Parmen. 28 B 8.30 D-K, A.R. 2.135, Anon. PVind. Rainer 29801.64 Bernsdorff (pap. saec. p.C. III), Anon. *GDRK* 56.24, Q.S. 5.270, *al.*, Orph. *Arg.* 610) + ἔμπεδον αἰέν (*Il.* 16.107 = Hes. fr. 294.4, cf. also Theogn. 1084, Solon *IEG* 15.3, A.R. 1.499, 646, *SEG* 27.844.25 (2nd cent. AD), *AVI* 79.3 (2nd/3rd cent. AD), Orph. *Arg.* 347, further *Il.* 15.683 ἔμπεδον ἀσφαλὲς αἰεί, see on such patterns Hainsworth 10). On the plaintive ἀεί see fr. 4.3b.

10.4a. ἔμπεδ' μένουσιν/ἔμπεδ(α) literally means 'remain in earth' and is probably meant to make a point, as Hipponax and an anonymous tragic poet (Aesch.?) are attested to have used ἔμπεδος in the sense χθόνιος, Hsch. ε 2425 ἐμπεδῆς <δὲ> γαμόρος/<ἔ>μαρψεν Ἅιδης (Adesp. *TrGF* 208)· ἔμπεδον ἔλεγον τὸν Ἅιδην, ὡς <καὶ> (add. Kannicht-Snell) Ἱππῶναξ (*IEG* 146a) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν πέδῳ καὶ χθόνιος (West: ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁ (vel ὢν) ἐν πέδῳ, χθόνιος Degani: ἀντίον τοῦ οὖν ἐμπέδου χθόνιος H) ~ Phot. *Lex.* ε 738. M. L. West, *BICS* 24 (1977), 97–8 proposed to establish it also in Aesch. *Ag.* 1172 (Cassandra) ἐγὼ δὲ θερμόνους τάχ' Ἐμπέδῳ (= Ἅιδῃ; ἐμπεδω codd.) βαλῶ. This sense lurks in A.R. 2.642–4 οὐδ' εἴ κε διὲξ Ἀίδαο βερέθρων/στελλοίμην, ἔτι τάρβος ἀνάψομαι, εὖτε πέλεσθε/ἔμπεδοι, Nonn. *D.* 19.6 Στάφυλον . . κατεύνασεν ἔμπεδος ὕπνος, 38.218, further Leon. Tar. *HE* 74.7–8 ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐγγαίων [= χθονίων] Ἀιδωνέος Ἑρμεία τε/καὶ Νυκτός, "an unusual sense, though in Plut. *Mor.* 953a Erebus is defined as τὸ χθόνιον καὶ ἔγγαιον σκότος", G-P ad loc.

10.4b. προσαυξάνεται is a term originally applied to vegetation, as ἀέξεται in fr. 9.1. The verb is exclusively prosaic, appearing first in Theophrastus and then in Polybius. As in fr. 4.2, the juxtaposition of high poetic and plain prosaic diction is noteworthy. If it applies

to Demeter, the goddess in her desperation might just be making a pessimistic prediction about her future (note προσ- and the present tense). Less likely, she might refer to the untoward incidents that occurred to her during her wanderings, see on these Richardson 1974, 74f., 178–9.

Fr. 11

It would seem that P., relying on the fundamental application of this term to anything twisted and gleaming, employed it with the meaning 'locks of (radiant) hair'. This gloss is first attested in Theophr. as 'tendril' of vine (see n. a) and of its applications attested after that, this meaning seems to be a prerequisite. ἐν ἄλλοις in the Σ A.R. implies more than one author and P. may be a victim of compression here. The traditional interest in Demeter's locks and the survival of this fragment would point to *Demeter*. P. may be responding to Demeter's glowing godhead in *HHD* 278–80:

τῆλε δὲ φέγγος ἀπὸ χροὸς ἀθανάτοιο
λάμπε θεᾶς, ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενήνοθεν ὤμους,
αὐγῆς δ' ἐπλήσθη πυκινὸς δόμος ἀστεροπῆς ὥς.

Note that ἄστλιγγας suggests the notion of radiance (see n. a *ad fin.*). In *HHD* radiance spreads ἀπὸ χροὸς ἀθανάτοιο, but cf. *Il.* 14.176–7 (Hera) *πλοκάμους . . φαεινούς*/καλοὺς ἀμβροσίους *ἐκ κράατος ἀθανάτοιο.* In P.'s passage, brilliance probably spread from Demeter's tresses, as its repercussions would suggest, Theoc. 7.147 πίθων ἀπελύετο κρατὸς ἄλειφαρ (apparently another misapplication of Theoc. to the head of wine-jars), Call. fr. 7.12 ἀπ' ὀστ⌞λι⌟γγων δ' αἰὲν ἄλειφα ῥέει of the anointed head of a statue of the Graces in Paros, *id. HyAp.* 9 ὡπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται ['shines'], ἀλλ' ὅτις ἐσθλός, *ibid.* 38–41. Note also Eros appearing to Philetas στιλπνὸς ὡς ἄρτι λελουμένος (Long. 2.4.1) and Elegy approaching Ovid in the programmatic *Am.* 3.1.7 *venit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos.* For a clue about the possible context of dropping unguents cf. *mutatis mutandis* Ov. *F.* 5.359 (Flora conversing with the poet) *adnuit, et motis flores cecidere capillis.*

Hair is often a subject of attention in the *HHD* and Demeter's free worn hair became a topos in descriptions of her grief, which found application in cult-practice. Demeter is καλλιπλόκαμος in *Il.* 14.326, ἠύκομος in *HHD* 1, 297, 315, Hes. fr. 280.20, Archestr. *SH*

135.1. Unbound hair is a symbol of mourning and grief[21] and Demeter reacts accordingly in *HHD* 40–2 ὀξὺ δέ μιν κραδίην ἄχος ἔλλαβεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαίταις/ἀμβροσίαις κρήδεμνα δαΐζετο χερσὶ φίλῃσι,/κυάνεον δὲ κάλυμμα κατ' ἀμφοτέρων βάλετ' ὤμων, cf. also Nonn. *D.* 6.6–9 κεφαλῆς γονόεσσαν ἀπεσφήκωσε καλύπτρην,/αὐχενίης λύσασα καθειμένα βόστρυχα χαίτης,/παιδὶ περιφρίσσουσα· βαρυνομένης δὲ θεαίνης/δάκρυσιν αὐτοχύτοισι καθικμαίνοντο παρειαί, Ov. *Met.* 5.472–3 (Demeter at spring Cyane) *inornatos laniavit diva capillos/et repetita suis percussit pectora palmis*, cf. 5.513 (Ceres before Zeus) *passis* . . . *capillis*. Passages such as these indicate that attention to the goddess' tresses would appear along with her tears (fr. 12). So the term may belong to the passage of the picturesque *locus amoenus*. Demeter laments her misfortunes there and such a point of focus would intensify the image of her deplorable state, which is perhaps meant to contrast to the exuberant beauty of the scenery. When the poet of the Homeric hymn wants to contrast Demeter's grievance to Celeus' daughters' gaiety, he again uses images involving hair, 177–8 ἤϊξαν . . . ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται/ὤμοις αἴσσοντο κροκηΐῳ ἄνθει ὁμοῖαι as contrasted to 181–2 ἣ δ' ἄρ' ὄπισθε φίλον τετιημένη ἦτορ/στεῖχε κατὰ κρῆθεν κεκαλυμμένη.

Demeter's unbound hair was imitated by her worshippers. The hair of her initiates was worn free in her cult, cf. Celeus' daughters in *HHD* 177–8 (quoted above), Call. *HyDem.* 124 ἀνάμπυκες, Nonn. *D.* 6.17 ἄπλοκον . . . βόστρυχον, a law regulating entrance to the temple of Despoina at Lycosura *LSCG* 68.9–11 (3rd cent. BC) μηδὲ τὰς τ[ρί]|χας ἀμπεπλεγμένας, μηδὲ κεκαλυμ|μένος and in a procession in honour of Demeter at Andania *LSCG* 65.22 μὴ ἐχέτω δὲ μηδεμία . . . μηδὲ ἀνάδεμα μηδὲ τὰς τρίχας ἀνπεπλεγμένας (see Richardson 1974, 203, 351 (Addenda), Hopkinson 1984, 41, 82–3).

Call. uses ὄστλιγγες in fr. 7.12 for the anointed and fragrant head of a statue of the Graces, but the passage that seems to be under direct Philitan influence is *HyAp.* 38–41. As the Graces-statue and Apollo in Call., P. might have first presented Demeter with hair anointed with aromatic oil. This would pointedly contravene the grieving person's traditional negligence of self caring, but it may be

---

[21] Cf. Alc. Mess. *HE* 14.2 ἄπλεκτον χαίταν ἐν χροῒ κειραμένα, see L. Sommer, *Das Haar im Religion und Aberglauben der Griechen*, Diss. Münster 1912, 77f., Richardson on *HHD* 41, Fantuzzi on Bion *EA* 20, Vian on Nonn. *D.* 11.239–41.

principally employed to make a ritualistic point as the unguent drops falling from the tresses of the goddess would hint at the habit of her initiates of anointing their στέμματα with fragrant unguents, cf. Philic. *SH* 680.38, *q.v.*, [μ]υ[ρη]ρούς (suppl. Ll-J – Parsons) σοι λιπανοῦσι κλῶνας, then Ov. *F.* 4.411 *unctas accendite taedas.* This tallies with the association of the olive-tree with the Demeter-myth (*HHD* 23 ἀγλαόκαρποι ἐλαῖαι, 100), cf. also that oil was poured on offerings to Demeter in Phigalia, Paus. 8.43.11 and that olive-branches were offered to Despoina in Lycosura, *LSCG* 68.13–4 (3rd cent. BC). The unguent locks of Demeter would also pay tribute to the renowned Coan perfumes.

Diogenianus may have used an ancient commentary on A.R. (Hollis 1998, 61f.), but Herodian's formulation suggests that originally this reference was inserted in a Σ on Call. *Aet.* 7.12, whence he and Diogenianus would pick it up. So the reference to P. would find itself in a Σ on ὄστλιγγες whence it would be detached into a separate lemma in Hesychius. Note the affinity of EtM α 1979 ἄστλιγγας· τὰς ὑποφυλλίδας τῶν βοτρύων with Hsch. ο 1452 ὄστλιγξ· . . . ἢ τὸ ἐν βότρυσι γινόμενον. The original Σ is likely to go back to Theon (fr. *163). The lexicographic references collected by Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 7.12 to illustrate ὄστλιγγες = 'locks of hair' provide a good example of how interest in Call. superseded and eventually brushed aside Philitan material.

11.a. ἄστλιγγας is a rare gloss known to Theophr. before P. with a capacity to denote "toutes choses qui s'enroulent et se replient", Chantraine *DE* s.v. ὄστλιγγες. In Theophr. *HP* 3.18.5 ἄνθος λευκὸν βοτρυῶδες . . . ὄστλιγγας ἔχον ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ βότρυς it means 'tendril' of vine and sounds like a technical term. In Call. fr. 7.12 (quoted in the same Apollonian Σ) the word denotes 'locks of hair' of the anointed statue of the Graces in Paros.[22] The word occurs two more times, A.R. 1.1296–97 τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε/ἄστλιγγες μαλεροῖο πυρὸς ὣς

---

[22] Already in Ar. fr. 348.1, where see K-A, the Muses are ἑλικοβοστρύχους. An alleged etymological link of βότρυς with βόστρυξ might have facilitated the application to hair, cf. for this link A.R. 2.677 (Apollo's hair in his magnificent epiphany) πλοχμοὶ βοτρυόεντες, Anon. *AP* 9.524.3 (Dionysus) βοτρυοχαίτης, Nonn. *D.* 25.162 βότρυν ἐθείρης, Christod. *AP* 2.91, 325–6, Joann. Gaz. 1.48 πλοκάμων ἑλικώδεϊ κόσμῳ, see Chrétien on Nonn. *D.* 10.182 and cf. EtG β 189 βόστρυχος· . . . παρὰ τὸ βότρυ{χο}ν βότρυχος καὶ βόστρυχος, ὁ βοτρυοειδής, Hsch. ο 1452 (quoted above) for ὄστλιγξ.

ἰνδάλλοντο 'like sparks of blazing fire' and Nic. *Alex.* 470 ὑπ' ὀστλίγγεσσιν ἀραιαῖς 'tentacles' of the sea-hare with Σ ad loc. (165.2 Geymonat) ὄστλιγγας δὲ λέγει τὰς βοστρύχους, see A. Crugnola, *Acme* 14 (1961), 132–3, Schmitt 82 n. 3. The only meaning other than λαμπηδόνες supplied by the Apollonian Σ is βόστρυχας quoting Call. fr. 7.12, cf. Hsch. o 1452 ὄστλιγξ· πλόκαμος, . . . βόστρυχος, Orion Theb. 116.29 ὄστλιγγες· αἱ τρίχες. Καλλίμαχος etc. The usual form of the word is ὄστλιγξ but *teste* Herodian P. and A.R. wrote ἄστλιγξ. The only extant occurrence in A.R. is *Arg.* 1.1297 where all sources provide the common form ὀστ-, but there is no reason to discredit Herodian. The Scholiast does not seem to know of any other occurrence in A.R. and seems a bit puzzled when he quotes Herodian. As Dr Campbell points out, the MSS' ὀστ- may be due to the preceding ὄσσε and, as the surviving fragments of A.R. show, his other works were not widely read to elicit much attention by the lexicographers.

The etymology of the term is obscure. The ancients advanced absurd explanations, such as παρὰ τὸ ὀστοῦν <καὶ τὸ> εἰλεῖσθαι, sampled in EtG (AB) s.v. ὄστλιγγες (*apud* G. Massimilla, *SIFC* 83 (1990), 183; from Orion *l.c.*?), cf. also Hsch. o 1452 ὄστλιγξ· πλόκαμος, <παρὰ τὸ> ἑλίξαι. The term in antiquity was related to brilliance, cf. Σ A.R. 1.1297 (117.13 Wendel) ὄστλιγγες· αἱ λαμπηδόνες (*sc.* τοῦ πυρός, as in EtG (AB) ὄστλιγγες· οἷον· [A.R. 1297]· ὄστλιγγές εἰσιν αἱ λαμπηδόνες τοῦ πυρός (τοῦ πυρ. om. A); note that some understood μαλερός, occurring in the Apollonian line, as 'glowing' (rather than 'blazing'), see Campbell on A.R. 3.291, Rengakos 1994, 110–1), Hsch. α 7862 ἄστλιγγας· αὐγάς, EtM α 1979 ἄστλιγγας· . . . οἱ δὲ ἀκτῖνος αὐγάς. To account for the differentiation in form (ὀστ-/ἀστ-) P. might have propounded an etymology which would accord with the conceivably anointed locks of Demeter. Such variations were not unusual, cf. Hsch. α 7137 ἄρεσχαι· κλήματα, βότρυες, *id.* o 1166 ὀρεσχάς· τὸ σὺν τοῖς βότρυσιν ἀφαιρεθὲν κλῆμα.

Fr. 12

P. has in mind here Achilleus and Priam's weeping in *Il.* 24. The fragment alludes to *Il.* 24.513–4 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα γόοιο τετάρπετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,/καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ' ἵμερος ἠδ' ἀπὸ γυίων etc. Cf., in a different context, Nonn. *D.* 6.50–2 (Demeter at Astraeus) ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μετὰ δαῖτα θεὰ κεκόρητο χορείης/σεισαμένη βαρὺ κέντρον ἀμερσινόοιο μερίμνης,/μαντοσύνην ἐρέεινε. The crucial verse *Il.* 24.514

was athetised in antiquity "as unnecessary and because of Aristarchus' view that γυῖα referred only to the hands and feet, not to all the limbs" (Richardson ad loc.). P.'s reference shows that the question of its authenticity was raised as early as his days. This phenomenon of scholarly questions playing a role in the making of poetry is attested also in fr. 13.1 ἐκ Διὸς ἄλγεα πέσσειν with reference to the disputed *Il.* 24.617 θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει.

Jacobs 121 was the first to print frr. 13 and 12 as a single fragment and a century later Maass 1985a, ix re-proposed the conjunction. It may well be true that these two fragments belong to the same context, but their conjunction seems unappealing. In fr. 13 the word is of a compromise that will bring about a permanent solution by an external intervention from Zeus. In fr. 12 there occurs a description of a psychological process, that satiation of weeping re-sulted in tranquillity of soul, far from the worries that tormented it.

But who is the figure who has had his fill of weeping and is eventually relieved by the satiation of his own tears? In principle, gods are beyond the realm of tears,[23] but the suffering character in the poem is Demeter and subsequent treatments of the myth present her reacting with tears to the abduction of her daughter. Call. *HyDem.* 17 μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμες ἃ δάκρυον [a collective singular, see Reed on Bion *EA* 64] ἄγαγε Δηοῖ and Philic. *SH* 680.40].πουδ[....]γου σοῖς προσανήσεις δακρύοισι πηγήν are the first testimonies. Then Ov. *F.* 4.521–2 *dixit, et ut lacrimae (neque enim lacrimare deorum est)/dedicit in tepidis lucida gutta sinus*, Nonn. *D.* 6.8–9 βαρυνομένης δὲ θεαίνης/δάκρυσιν αὐτοχύτοισι καθικμαίνοντο παρειαί.[24] A variation of this motif occurs in Claud. *RP* 1.190f. with Demeter crying when she abandons Sicily for Ida in Crete, 192–3 *heu quotiens praesaga mali violavit aborto/rore genas.* Adversely, when she finds out about Persephone's abduction *haeserunt lacrimae, nec vox aut spiritus oris redditur* (3.151) and she is unable

---

[23] Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1396 (Artemis) κατ' ὄσσων δ' οὐ θέμις βαλεῖν δάκρυ, Q.S. 3.642–3 and see Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 17 and D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic*, Oxford 1991, 156 with n. 116. The only instance of a god actually crying in Homer is *Il.* 21.493 ~ 496 (Artemis abused by Hera).

[24] The wording in Call. *HyDem.* 17 is Callimachean, cf. *HE* 34.1–2 ἐς δέ με δάκρυ/ἤγαγεν. The wording in Nonn. *D.* 6.8–9 reflects Call. *Hec.* fr. 48.5 τινθαλέοισι κατικμήναιντο λοετροῖς. Interestingly, in the 'Athenian' Hymn in Nonn. *D.* 19.88 beside the tomb of Celeus ὄμμασι ἀκλαύτοισι Θαλυσιὰς ἔστενε Δηώ. In Ov. *F.* 4.523 with Demeter *flent pariter molles animis virgoque senexque*, i.e. Celeus and his daughter.

to weep (3.159–60). κορεσσάμενος implies satiation, but gods indulge in only moderate weeping in epic. P. would know that, as with other excitements, satiation of tears is quick, *Od.* 4.103 αἰψηρὸς δὲ κόρος κρυεροῖο γόοιο. In view of the goddess' possible self-restraint the Homeric formula may be deliberately misused.

In *HHD* Demeter is distraught and angry (40–2, 56, 76–7, 198) but does not cry. The tears of Demeter is a device which predates Philicus and Call. The latter in *HyDem.* 17 apparently has in mind a specific passage in which Demeter is brought to tears. The aphorism μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμες indicates that this is not a version that Call. treated elsewhere.[25] It is only this fragment of P., as was first suggested by Cessi 1908, 124–5 in a different context, that suggests a link with the novel feature. Its subsequent popularity shows that Demeter's tears were not shed in vain. The question is inevitably related to the hypothesis of an alleged Hellenistic prototype of Ov. *F.* 4.419–620, but Ovid is unlikely to have picked up the motif of Demeter's tears directly from or through P. and his source does not need to go that far, when a reference in Call. is at hand. He shows a penchant to present gods weeping and Demeter would be most suitable for such an application.

12.1a. καὶ γάρ τις The poet assumes here what seems to be a didactic/ironic tone: 'Because, of course, when someone . . .'. καί means 'in fact', Denniston 108–9. If the fragment refers to Demeter, it treats her feelings as if of a human being.

12.1b. μελέοιο μέλεος means 'vain, unavailing' in Homer but '*miser*' in tragedy. Ancient critics were aware of this change of meaning, cf. Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 16.336a (IV.238 Erbse) μέλεον ἀντὶ τοῦ μελέως, ματαίως. καὶ διὰ παντὸς οὕτως Ὅμηρος χρῆται· οἱ δὲ τραγικοὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκτροῦ καὶ τάλανος and see Erbse (III.102) on Σ *Il.* 10.480a. Hellenistic poets affected its ambiguous usage, cf. Call. *HyDel.* 117 μέλεοι γὰρ ἀπειρήκασι τένοντες (the only occurrence in Call.), Alex. Aet. *CA* 3.17 ὅταν ἀρνῆται μέλεον γάμον ἀγλαὸς Ἀνθεύς. A.R. employs μέλεος in both senses, e.g. 1.616 ὦ μέλεαι ('tragic') as well as 3.487–8

[25] L. Malten, *Hermes* 45 (1910), 548 assumed a Callimachean treatment in the *Aetia*, see Hinds 115 n. 28. Pohlenz 35 with n. 2 thought that Ovid draws his tears directly from P., but see Bömer ad loc., H. Herter, *RhM* n.s. 90 (1941), 254 with n. 35, 257.

μελέη . . . /ἐλπωρή, cf. also the intriguing 1.1249 μελέη δέ οἱ ἔπλετ' αὐτή 'feeble' (see M. Campbell, *CQ* n.s. 21 (1971), 410), cf. the echo in Opp. *Hal.* 4.631 and see in general Livrea on A.R. 4.605, Rengakos 1994, 114. The word is ambivalent here too, as Demeter's lament is both miserable and vain. P. seems to be the first to take advantage of its ambiguity.

12.1c. μελέοιο . . κλαυθμοῖο κλαυθμός is picked up directly from *Il.* 24.717 (7x in Homer: *Il. l.l.*, *Od.* 6x). Its only adj. in Homer is *Od.* 17.8 κλαυθμοῦ τε στυγεροῖο. It is rare in poetry afterwards, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1554, ousted by the erudite poets, next *GVI* 1897.25 (2nd cent. BC), *IMEG* 87.1 (2nd cent. AD), Q.S. 3.521 (quoted in 1d).

12.1d. κορεσσάμενος κλαυθμοῖο is a variation of *Il.* 24.717 ἄσεσθε κλαυθμοῖο, cf. then Q.S. 3.521 κλαυθμοῦ ἄδην κορέσασθαι and further *Il.* 22.427 κορεσσάμεθα κλαίοντε, *Od.* 20.59, 4.541 = 10.499, *Il.* 23.157 γόοιο . . . ἆσαι and see J. Latacz, *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers*, Heidelberg 1966, 187–9. In lamentation contexts κορέννυμι in Homer always governs a participle but it is common with an abstract object in the genitive, *Il.* 11.562, *Od.* 11.421, *al.* The expression may keep up with the abstention-of-food-metaphors occurring in frr. 9, 10 and 13.

12.2a. κήδεα . . εἷλεν Cf. A.R. 2.240–1 ἀδινὸν δ' ἕλε κῆδος ἕκαστον/ ἡρώων, 2.858 κῆδος ἕλοντο/, 3.692. In Homer cf. *Od.* 6.140 ἐκ δέος εἵλετο γυίων, 10.363 ἐκ κάματον . . εἵλετο γυίων, 11.201 μελέων ἐξείλετο (θυμόν) varied in Theoc. 17.24 μελέων ἐξείλετο (γῆρας).

12.2b. δειλαίων As γαληναίῃ in fr. 4.2, δειλαίων is a choicer variation of the Homeric δειλός ('wretched', not 'cowardly', see Janko on *Il.* 13.275–8). The form is first attested in Hippon. *IEG* 36.4 (quoted in n. 2c), cf. also Adesp. Iamb. *IEG* 14.2, but it is above all a *vox tragica*, whence it passes over to Hellenistic poetry (mostly in vocative): Call. 5x with an accumulation in *HyDem.* 83 (Hopkinson ad loc.), 93, 100, all referring to victims of Demeter's wrath, A.R. only 3.464, 8x in the Theocritean corpus, Arat. 946, Leon. Tar. *HE* 16.5, Bion fr. 1.4. — Hellenistic poets could not ignore the prestigious heritage of classical tragedy. Eur. *Aeolus* influenced P.'s *Hermes*, as Eur. *Medea* did with A.R.'s character. In this fragment μελέοιο and δειλαίων have a tragic background. δμωίδες in fr. 17 first occurs in Aeschylean lyrics and P.'s possible ὕπαρνος (Hsch. υ 243) first in

Euripidean ones. If P. in fr. 26 wrote Ἀργανθώνιον <αἶπος>/, that may rely on tragic parallels too. So e.g. Call. *HyDem.* 34 πάντας δ' ἀνδρογίγαντας ὅλαν πόλιν ἀρκίος ἆραι glances at Eur. *Phoen.* 1131–32 γίγας ἐπ' ὤμοις γηγενὴς ὅλην πόλιν/φέρων (see F. Bornmann, *ZPE* 91 (1992), 15–7), *id.* fr. 1.36 *et c.* at Eur. *Her.* 637–40 (see Massimilla on fr. 1.39f.) and on tragic diction in Call. see Schmitt 157–8. Theoc. 1.115–6 recalls tragic typology, cf. Soph. *Phil.* 916–7. In A.R. cf. in particular 3.791f. and see Campbell 1983, 41–2, 109 n. 14 and in general Hunter 1996, 2–3.

12.2c. δειλαίων . . ἀπὸ πραπίδων In Homer δειλός is used exclusively of persons, but cf. Hippon. *IEG* 36.4 (Plutos) δείλαιος γὰρ τὰς φρένας, Men. *Sic.* fr. 5 Sandbach δείλαιαι φρένες. "Dicuntur autem πραπίδες δειλαῖαι, poetarum more, quum ipse homo fuerit δείλαιος, δειλός, miser", Kayser 38. — Hellenistic poets and esp. Call. have a strong preference for placing the preposition between the noun and its adj., cf. e.g. Call. *HyAp.* 59 καλῇ ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ περιηγέος ἐγγύθι λίμνης, see McLennan on Call. *HyJov.* 48 and cf. in Homer *Il.* 13.667 νούσῳ ὑπ' ἀργαλέῃ φθίσθαι οἷς ἐν μεγάροισιν ~ *Od.* 15.354.

12.2d. πραπίδων The term occurs 11x in Homer and 7x in Hesiod, always in the plural (see Erbse (III.233) on Σ A *Il.* 11.579b, S. D. Sullivan, *Glotta* 65 (1987), 182–93). Here, as often in early epic, πραπίδες are envisaged as the centre of psychological suffering, e.g. *Il.* 22.43 ἦ κέ μοι αἰνὸν ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἄχος ἔλθοι, *Il.* 24.514 καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ' ἵμερος ἠδ' ἀπὸ γυίων, then A.R. 3.764–5 ὁππότ' ἀνίας/ἀκάματοι πραπίδεσσιν ἐνισκίμψωσιν Ἔρωτες (the only occurrence in A.R., an ambiguous use covering both the physical and mental sense). In Hellenistic and Imperial times, however, πραπίδες were perceived mainly as the centre of intellectual activity, cf. Adesp. Pap. Epigr. *SH* 979.5 = *FGE* 151b.5 (Homer) ἀπ' ἀθανάτων . . πραπίδων, Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1086 λευκῶν πραπίδων glossed as κακῶν φρενῶν by Hsch. λ 746, Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 962.15 μετὰ πραπίδεσσι βαλεσ[θ- which is a mere variation of the Homeric μετὰ φρεσὶ βάλεσθε. Erudite poets only rarely use the term, 1x in A.R., cf. Maiist. 46, Archim. Syr.? *SH* 201.41, POxy. 3535.i.16 (pap. saec. p.C. II; Hellenistic hexameter). Instead, they prefer φρένες, 30x in A.R. Its use in Hellenistic inscriptions continued unabated, *GVI* 475.2 (Cos, 2nd/1st cent. BC) δακρυόεν πέ[νθος ἐνὶ] πραπίσιν/, 658.5 (3rd cent. BC), 705.6 (1st cent. BC *ex.*), 748a.8 (3rd cent. BC), 755.1 (*c.* 100

BC), 1028.2 (2nd/3rd cent. BC) 1042.4 (2nd/3rd cent. BC), 1149.12 (2nd cent. BC *in.*), 1516.2 (2nd/1st cent. BC), 1700.2 (1st cent. BC), *EG* 853.3 Kaibel (2nd cent. BC?). Later Crinag. *GPh* 7.6, [Opp.] 4x, Q.S. 1x, oracle 473.14 P-W (3rd cent. AD), Nonn. 8x.

Fr. 13

The fragment contains typical words of consolation, perhaps addressed to Demeter by one of her hosts. Since Chalcon can be said to have been given an important role in the poem, one assumes that it could be him. In the prototype passage, Adesp. Eleg. *IEG* 21 (quoted in n. 2b), which could be part of another consolatory effort, it is stated that suffering and deliverance from suffering both lie in the authority of Zeus, cf. Nausicaa's attempt to console Odysseus in *Od.* 6.188–9, and therefore one should come to terms with him for a resolution. Apparently, the power attributed to non-cooperating Zeus is here transposed to all-healing χρόνος. Chalcon's consolation seems to take the form of advice. In *HHD* 216–8 disguised Demeter is consoled by Metaneira in similar terms (in 82f. by Helios in dissimilar): ἀλλὰ θεῶν μὲν δῶρα καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἀνάγκῃ/τέτλαμεν ἄνθρωποι· ἐπὶ γὰρ ζυγὸς αὐχένι κεῖται./νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ἵκεο δεῦρο, παρέσσεται ὅσσα τ' ἐμοί περ. Perhaps P. made an effort to enhance Chalcon's stature by presenting him as somehow contributing with common-place pieces of advice towards a settlement of the Zeus/Demeter dispute. Coan judges enjoyed abroad an early reputation as διαλλακταί, see C. V. Crowther, *Chiron* 29 (1999), 251f., 305f.

13.1a. ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ Cf. Pind. *O.* 10.7 ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος, Eur. *Ion* 15 ὡς δ' ἦλθεν χρόνος, Nonn. *D.* 11.520 ἀλλὰ τότε χρόνος ἦλθε μεμορμένος, 45.273 ἀλλὰ . . ὅτε χρόνος ἦλθε χορείης. ἀλλ' ὅτε (δὴ) comes up very often in this *sedes* in Homer to introduce a new stage in a continued narration or speech. The closest Homeric parallels are *Od.* 1.16 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε and *Od.* 2.107 = 18.152 = 24.142 ἀλλ' ὅτε τέτρατον ἦλθε ἔτος καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὧραι. ἐπέρχομαι is a *vox propria* for time to come.

13.1b. ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ may be echoed in Call. *HyAp.* 37 ἐπὶ χνόος ἦλθε in a passage that might be replete with reminiscences from P., cf. then Joann. Gaz. 2.158 (lightning) ἐπὶ χρόνον ἦλθεν ἰωῆς. Imitation of a sound-effect such as this are a feature of learned poetry, see

McLennan on Call. *HyJov.* 12 κεχρημένον Εἰλειθυίης ~ [Theoc.] 25.35 κεχρημένος εἰλήλουθας, cf. also e.g. Call. *Hec.* fr. 70.9 ἔρυμα χθονός from *Il.* *4.137 = Hes. *WD* *536 ἔρυμα χροός, A.R. 4.1126 γήθησε δὲ θυμὸς ἑκάστου from *Il.* 23.370 πάτασσε δὲ θυμὸς ἑκάστου, *id.* 2.108 ὑπὲρ ὀφρύος ἤλασε χειρί ~ Theoc. 22.104 ὕπερθε κατ' ὀφρύος ἤλασε πυγμῇ (see Vian on A.R. 2.109), Antag. *CA* 1.1 ἐν δοιῇ μοι θυμός, ὅ τοι γένος ἀμφίσβητον from Call. *HyJov.* 5 ἐν δοιῇ μάλα θυμός, ἐπεὶ γένος ἀμφήριστον, Erat. *CA* 22 περὶ τράγων ὠρχήσαντο from Call. *HyJov.* 52 περὶ πρύλιν ὠρχήσαντο, Leon. Tar. *HE* 12.1 ἄκρον ἐρώτων/ echoing Call. *HyAp.* 112 ἄκρον ἄωτον/ and the internal echo in A.R. 3.290 κατείβετο θυμὸς ἀνίῃ ~ 3.1131 κατείβετο θυμὸς ἀκουῇ. *Klangwirkungen* certainly played a role in Homer too, e.g. *Il.* 9.324 κακῶς δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλει αὐτῇ from *Il.* 11.604 κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή (see Hainsworth on the former passage), *Il.* 12.187 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα Πύλωνα καὶ Ὄρμενον ἐξενάριξεν from *Il.* 11.422 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα Θόωνα καὶ Ἔννομον ἐξενάριξεν, *Il.* 17.330 ὑπερδέα δῆμον ἔχοντας from formulae like *Il.* 19.229, *al.* νηλέα θυμὸν ἔχοντας (see Edwards on the former passage), *Od.* 10.436 ὁ θρασὺς εἴπετ' Ὀδυσσεύς from *Il.* 20.320 ὁ κλυτὸς ἦεν Ἀχιλλεύς, *Il.* 23.483 Αἶαν, νείκει ἄριστε, κακοφραδές from *Il.* 3.39 = 13.769 Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε, γυναιμανές. — On the correption of -ῃ at the feminine caesura see p. 82.

13.1c. ἐκ Διός is to be conjoined rather with ἄλγεα than with πέσσειν (though both are possible) as in the Iliadic model, 24.617 θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει, where see Richardson. In general, epic Zeus is the *persona propria* to allot grief (cf. *Il.* 2.375, *al.*, *Od.* 8.81–2, *al.*, Mimn. *IEG* 2.15–6), but the phrase here may specifically refer to the role played by Zeus in the rape of Persephone. Zeus is involved already in the first attestation of the myth in Hes. *Theog.* 913–4 (Persephone) ἣν Ἀιδωνεύς/ἥρπασεν ἧς παρὰ μητρός, ἔδωκε δὲ μητίετα Ζεύς ~ *HHD* 2–3, an indication that this was an integral element of the myth at its birth, cf. also *HHD* 21, 27, 77–80, see Förster 35 n. 1, Richardson on *HHD* 3, Foley 32, then Eur. *Hel.* 1317–19, [Apollod.] 1.5.1 Διὸς συνεργοῦντος. In Ov. *F.* 4.584 Pluto is called *Jovis frater.* Zeus' involvement goes through varying degrees of intensity, at first beginning with simple assent to the rape and later ending up in clear patronage. In Claud. *RP* 2.204–46 Zeus even hurls a thunderbolt to prevent Athena and Artemis from rescuing Persephone at the moment of her abduction (see Gruzelier on 1.121).

Zeus' role may have been pointed out in Demeter's grievous speech (see fr. 10.1a) and apparently her consoler takes this element up. In *HHD* 91 χωσαμένη δήπειτα κελαινεφέι Κρονίωνι Demeter instantly realises that her daughter's fate could not have been determined without Zeus' consent and turns her anger against him, cf. *mutatis mutandis* her angry speeches in both Ovidian versions, *Met.* 6.509f. and *F.* 4.585f.

13.1d. ἐκ Διὸς ἄλγεα πέσσειν The fact that P. overtly alludes to *Il.* 24.617 (Niobe, another *mater dolorosa*) θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει, reproducing the ingesting-grief-instead-of-food irony, perhaps indicates that he, along with Call. *HyAp.* 22 καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος, regarded *Il.* 24.614–7 as genuine, cf. also the contemporary treatments of the Niobe-myth by Euph. *CA* 102 (Σ A *Il.* 24.602, V.619 Erbse), Simias *CA* 5 (Parth. *Erot. path.* 33) and perhaps Antim. *Artemis* frr. 108–9. Later Aristoph. Byz. and Aristarchus athetised the lines but P.'s allusion shows that the question of their authenticity had been raised as early as his day, see Williams on Call. *HyAp.* 22, Rengakos 1993, 95–6.

13.1e. ἄλγεα πέσσειν is a medley of two different Homeric constructions, *Il.* 3.157, *al.* ἄλγεα πάσχω and *Il.* 24.617 = 24.637 κήδεα πέσσει, both rhythmically similar, cf. further *Il.* 1.81 χόλον καταπέψῃ, *Il.* 4.513 = 9.565 χόλον . . πέσσειν whence *GVI* 1610.3 (1st/2nd cent. BC), Nonn. *D.* 42.183–4 πέσσων/. . . ἕλκος ἐρώτων. After *Il.* 24.617, Pind. *O.* 1.55–6 καταπέψαι/μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη of Tantalus' disastrous dinner for the gods, offers a similar allusive usage. Ancient philologists were confused as to whether πέσσω means 'nurse one's anger for a long time' and thus let it grow and become μῆνις or κότος 'uncompromising wrath', as Σ T *Il.* 5.513b (I.534 Erbse) and Apoll. Soph. 96.7 suggest, or 'ingest it, let it cool down', as Σ D *Il.* 4.513 καταδαπανᾷ ἢ πραΰνει ("non recte" Ebeling s.v. πέσσω b) and Aristotle understand it, *EN* 1126a22 οἱ δὲ πικροὶ δυσδιάλυτοι, καὶ πολὺν χρόνον ὀργίζονται· κατέχουσι γὰρ τὸν θυμὸν . . . διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ ἐπιφανὲς εἶναι οὐδὲ συμπείθει αὐτοὺς οὐδείς, ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ πέψαι τὴν ὀργὴν χρόνου δεῖ, see Bonaldi 266–71. In this passage both interpretations are possible depending on whether ἐκ Διός is conjoined with ἄλγεα (then 'cool down') or ἔλλαχε (then 'suffer'). The consolatory character of the lines suggests that the primary meaning would be, as in Aristotle and Hippocrates, 'ingest to cool down'. Medical

language may have played a role here, cf. Hippocr. *Acut.* 42.1 (VI.2.54 Jouanna) ἀγρυπνίαι τε συμπίπτουσιν αὐτοῖσι, δι᾽ ἃς οὐ πέσσεται ἡ νοῦσος, περίλυποι δὲ καὶ πικροὶ γίνονται καὶ παραφρονέουσι.

13.2a. ἔλλαχε In a polytheistic system the division of 'spheres of influence' among the gods is a prerequisite for the balance of the universe and the Greeks imagined this process to have taken place in the form of a lottery, cf. Call. fr. 119. ἔλλαχε (along with the high-styled ἔμμορε) is the verb usually employed to denote this division of power, cf. *Il.* 15.190–2 (Poseidon) ἤτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἅλα . . ./παλλομένων, Ἀίδης δ᾽ ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα,/Ζεὺς δ᾽ ἔλαχ᾽ οὐρανὸν εὐρύν, Hes. *Theog.* 203–4, *HHD* 87, *HHHerm.* 478, Panyas. *EGF* 13.1, 3, Antim. fr. 131.2, Call. *HyDel.* 74 and esp. the Hellenistic anonymous *Hymn to Demeter SH* 990.5, 7, 9.[26] The supplement of the verb here (ἄλγεα πέσσειν) reproduces the ironic tone of *Il.* 24.617 (quoted in n. 1d): Demeter's share in divine power amounts to nothing other than the nursing of griefs. This ironic use of ἔλλαχε can be paralleled with Mimn. *IEG* 12.1 Ἠέλιος μὲν γὰρ ἔλαχεν πόνον ἤματα πάντα, Stesich. *PMGF* 232.3 κήδεα δὲ στοναχάς τ᾽ Ἀίδας ἔλαχε and *HHD* 87, Anon. *GDRK* 48.9, further Call. *HyDel.* 96–7 (Apollo to Thebes) σὺ δὲ τέκνα κακογλώσσοιο γυναικός/ἔλλαχες, Nonn. *D.* 8.139 (Danae) λάχεν ἕδνος ἔρωτος ὕδωρ ἁλός.

13.2b. καὶ πενθέων φάρμακα μοῦνος ἔχει is modelled on Adesp. Eleg. *IEG* 21 Ζεὺς πάντων αὐτὸς φάρμακα μοῦνος ἔχει, cf. also Solon *IEG* 16.1–2 γνωμοσύνης . . ./μέτρον, ὃ δὴ πάντων πείρατα μοῦνον ἔχει, Hes. fr. 307.2 (Paieon) ὃς ἁπάντων φάρμακα οἶδεν. καί denotes identity, cf. also in direct speech A.R. 1.347 αὐτὸς ὅ τις ξυνάγειρε καὶ ἀρχεύοι ὁμάδοιο, 3.174–5, see K-G ii, 231 (mostly prosaic). φάρμακον belongs to medical language. πενθέων φάρμακα is yet another novelty based on *Od.* 4.220–1 φάρμακον . . ./νηπενθές . . . κακῶν ἐπίληθον ἁπάντων varied in Call. *HE* 42.4 πανακὲς πάντων φάρμακον. Cf. also *Il.* 15.394 φάρμακ᾽ ἀκήματ᾽ . . . ὀδυνάων ~ Nonn. *D.* 6.364, Hippon. *IEG* 39.4 φάρμακον πονηρίης with Degani on (his) fr. 43.2, Eur. *Bac.* 283 φάρμακον πόνων, *id.* fr. 1079 λύπης φάρμακον ~ Maccius *GPh* 4.4, Emped. 31 B 111.1 D-K φάρμακα . . . κακῶν ~ Carcin. *TrGF* 70 F 71, Philemon *PCG* 77.1, *CEG* 656.2 (4th cent. BC) βλαψίφρονος

[26] See Richardson on *HHD* 85f., Williams on Call. *HyAp.* 43 on ἔλλαχε, Campbell on A.R. 3.3–4 on ἔλλαχε/ἔμμορε and in general Burkert 1985, 248, Bremmer 4. The whole semantic range of λαγχάνω is examined in Perpillou 165f.

μανίας φάρμακα, see *LSJ* s.v. φάρμακον II.1. μοῦνος belongs to typical religious language, see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1280–82. ἔχει is a gnomic present.

Fr. 14

The reference to a swarm of bees contained in this hexameter offers a two-fold link to *Demeter*, as bees are intimately associated with both Demeter and Cos. The goddess' sacred animal *par excellence* was the bee, Σ Pind. *P.* 4.106a (Pind. fr. 158) ταῖς ἱεραῖσ<ι> μελίσσαις τέρπεται. The notorious purity of the insect granted it the goddess' favour (διὰ τὸ τοῦ ζῴου καθαρόν, Σ Pind. *l.c.*). Demeter's initiates and priestesses were called Μέλισσαι.[27] Presence of animals often preempts the epiphany of a god related to them, see Williams on Call. *HyAp.* 5. It seems that the epiphany of Demeter was hailed with appearance of creatures which are associated with her, such as bees and Nymphs. P. may have taken advantage of the ambiguity of 'bees' as 'initiates in Demeter's rites', if the Nymphs which conceivably appeared in the *locus* were specified as ὀροδεμνιάδες, see p. 261f. At the same time Cos was — and still is — an island famed for its excellent honey, cf. Strabo 10.5.9 ἅπαν μὲν οὖν τὸ νησιωτικὸν μέλι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ ἀστεῖόν ἐστι καὶ ἐνάμιλλον τῷ 'Αττικῷ, τὸ δ' ἐν ταῖσδε ταῖς νήσοις [a group of islands including Cos] διαφερόντως, μάλιστα δὲ τὸ Καλύμνιον, see Craik 15. Coan honey would have been esp. appreciated in Alexandria where exports are recorded, but although income from beekeeping was liable to taxation, production of fine honey would give Cos more fame than fiscal revenues or hard currency.[28]

In this fragment a male character (φθάμενος) swaggers towards a beehive and an assumption suggested by some indications (see ff.) would be that Chalcon hastily stepped towards a swarm of bees. The air of informality with the second person address (προσεβήσαο)

[27] In Hellenistic poetry cf. Call. *HyAp.* 110, Philic. *SH* 680.52 γυναικῶν . . . ἑσμός, Adesp. Pap. Misc. *SH* 990.2 (ὕ]μνον Δήμη[τρ]ος)]κλαπακούσατε, . . μέλισσαι. Demeter is represented on coins with bees (L. Armbruster, "Die Biene auf griechische Münzen", *Archiv für Bienenkunde* 33 (1952), 49–73) and her daughter bore the cult-epithet μελιτώδης (Gow on Theoc. 15.94). See Cook 14f., Bodson 25–38 ("Présence de l'abeille dans le culte de Démeter") and Spanoudakis 2000, 38 n. 20.

[28] On Coan exports to Alexandria see Craik 17. Coans might have enjoyed a reputation for honey-sweetened cakes. A traditional Coan delicacy was called παῖσα (Athen. 14.646f) and according to Hsch. δ 2172 the Coans used the term δόλπαι for traditional cakelets: δόλπαι· πλακούντια μικρά· Κῷοι. P. in *At. Gl.* fr. 36 discussed ἀμόραι, a small cake sweetened with honey.

tallies with this assumption. The story might have, along with its cultic significance, the function of an aetium for the institution of apiculture in Cos. Demeter's association with bees would render her an appropriate introducer of apiculture in Cos. In historic terms, beekeeping was probably brought in by the Thessalian immigrants. Aristaeus, its *prôtos euretês*, is a son of Apollo and the Thessalian nymph Cyrene. Thessaly is the place whence Demeter and Chalcon's family were introduced in Cos and a tradition may credit them with this benefaction. One wonders if honey featured in Chalcon's feast. This would meet with the approval of Demeter since the cyceon contained honey (A. Delatte, *Cycéon*, Paris 1955, 23–40 *passim*), cf. that in Ov. *F.* 4.545–6 Celeus sets out *liquefacta coagula lacte/pomaque et in ceris aurea mella suis.* Virg. *G.* 1.343–7 advises the farmer to offer wine and honey to Ceres at the beginning of spring and Paus. 8.42.11 reports that the Phigalians annually offered honey-combs, together with other crops, to the altar of Demeter.

On the second person address Σ bT (ex.) *Il.* 16.787 (IV.300 Erbse) note that it expresses sympathy for a misfortune (usually death), but it may also be employed to express friendly intimacy as with benign Eumaeus (15x in the *Od.*). This feeling of compassion may be related to φθάμενος, which seems to denote a hasty, amateurish involvement with bees. It would be ironic, if the favourite insect of Demeter attacked her host (for the notion of dangerous bees see Robert-Tornow 60–5). Lobel, very tentatively, attempted to read βελόνησι μέλι[σσαι in Call. fr. 21.11 in a context of χλεύη in the cult of Demeter. προσεβήσαο μακρά, usually used of the march of heroes, would in that case be meant to ridicule Chalcon's groundless confidence.

βουγενέας is significant. Hinting at a birth from the putrefying corpse of an ox, it superbly undermines the notion of purity with which the poem and Demeter are particularly concerned. At the same time, it may constitute an allusion to Demeter's association with rotten flesh. During the first day of the Thesmophoria the ἀντλήτριαι bore from underground chambers the rotten carcasses of pigs which had been thrown in there at an earlier date. These were placed on altars and then scattered in the fields to fertilise the earth, Σ Luc. *Dial. mer.* 2.1 (275.23 Rabe).[29] F. Jacoby (*FGrH* IIIb Suppl.

[29] See Nilsson 1906, 319–21, Deubner 40f., Burkert 1985, 242–3 with 442 n. 14 ("in the Demeter sanctuary at Cnidos, a small circular chamber was found containing pig bones and marble votive pigs"), K. Clinton in Hägg 72f.

2, 204) suggested Apollodorus of Athens Περὶ θεῶν as the source of this Σ.

This fragment also refers to coeval paradoxography, as fr. 20 which may come also from *Demeter*. The *mirabile* here is bugony, the spontaneous generation of bees from the dead body of an ox. Arist., the uncontested authority on the subject (Byl 340–55), was at a loss about the mode of engenderment of bees (*GA* 759a8 ἡ δὲ τῶν μελιττῶν γένεσις ἔχει πολλὴν ἀπορίαν) and so were other specialists such as Colum. 9.2.4 and Pliny *NH* 11.46. The reason is obvious: *apium enim coitus visus est numquam*, Pliny *l.c.*[30] Popular belief did not bother about all this scientifically based speculation. The notion of bugony was a widespread conviction of the ancient world which found a quick welcome in Hellenistic poetry and broad recognition in technical literature.[31] As scorpions are generated from the body of crocodiles, wasps from a dead horse and beetles from carcasses of asses, even snakes from the spinal cord of a human corpse (Archel. Chers. *SH* 129 = *FGE* 3), so bees can be hatched from the corpse of a dead ox.

Virg. *G.* 4.287 places the idea specifically in Egypt, the country seen as the provenance of all marvels. Belief in bugony was widespread in Egypt[32] whence it was probably introduced to Greece. Aristotle is the only ancient source failing to discuss bugony. He offers an exhaustive discussion mentioning a number of theories, some of which are not immune to popular belief, and the missing out of bugony suggests that he had not heard of it rather than that he rated it unworthy of his attention. This should mean that the notion

---

[30] On the ancients' puzzlement over the engenderment of bees cf. Aristotle's speculation in *HA* 553a17f. See Byl 344–5, Mynors on Virg. *G.* 4.197–209, S. Föllingen, "Die Aristotelische Forschung zur Fortpflanzung und Geschlechtsbestimmung den Bienen" in *id.*-W. Kullmann, *Aristotelische Biologie*, Stuttgart 1997, 375–85. The procreation without sexual intercourse accounts for their association with chastity, see Robert-Tornow 12–8, 42–3, Davies-Kathirithamby 279–80, S. Pomeroy, *Xenophon, Oeconomicus*, Oxford 1994, 279–80. Lyrica Adesp. *CA* 7.16 calls bees δυσέρωτες.

[31] References in F. Olck, *RE* III.1.434–5, C. R. Osten-Sacken, *On the Oxen-born Bees of the Ancients*, Heidelberg 1894 (with additions 1895), Robert-Tornow 19–28, H. M. Ransome, *The Sacred Bee in Ancient Times and Folklore*, London 1937, 112–8, Fraser i, 779, ii, 1088 n. 447, *FGE*, 22, Davies-Kathirithamby 65–6, Mynors 293–4. On similar paradoxic births see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 15.368 and on spontaneous generation in general, decisively refuted only in 1864 by Louis Pasteur, see Davies-Kathirithamby 21–2. On other paradoxic beliefs about bees cf. [Arist.] *Mir.* 16–22, Ael. *NA* 5.42.

[32] Cf. Plut. *Cleom.* 39.4, Antig. Car. *Mir.* 19 ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, see F. Olck, *RE* III.1.435, A. S. F. Gow, *CR* 58 (1944), 14–5, Mynors on Virg. *G.* *l.l.*

became known to Greece only when contacts with Alexandria intensified. The transition from Egypt must have taken place around P.'s days. He seems to be the first Greek author to evidence knowledge of the marvel.[33]

Maass 1895b, 295 (a book described by K. Ziegler, *RE* XVIII.1203 as "phantastisch und unzuverlässig") thought that P. dealt extensively with bugony as part of a treatment of Aristaeus' myth. This was tentatively accepted by Kuchenmüller 79 n. 6 ("Fortasse . . . breviter") and by F. Williams, ^{3}*OCD*, 1164. Von Blumenthal 2168 held that the verse is "unmistakably" related to the myth of Comatas in a bucolic poem by P. and Webster 42 n. 2 that it "certainly alludes to the myth of Comatas or Aristaeos". Maass' arguments were effectively demolished by Rohde *Kl. Schr.* ii, 310–1, but a remark by Mynors 294 that the heap of concise references to bugony "suggest that the subject has already been treated in poetry" prompted Thomas 44 n. 70 to independently revive the old proposal. Antigonus introduces the Egyptian marvel[34] by a short description of the process as his source had it, and then comes to his poetic quotation: ᾧ καὶ φαίνεται Φιλίτας προσέχειν, ἱκανῶς ὢν περίεργος· προσαγορεύει οὖν αὐτὰς βουγενεῖς λέγων· βουγενέας etc. φαίνεται προσέχειν is an expression of doubt which is not due to the loss of the context. Then Antig. adds that P. προσαγορεύει 'calls' bees oxen-born — no more. As Rohde pointed out "es ist durch Antigonus' Redeweise geradezu ausgeschlossen zu glauben, daß P. jenes Mirakel erzählend berichtet habe".

14.a. βουγενέας βουγενής is not a new adj. It was a "specifically Argive" (Jacoby *ad l.s.*) cult-epithet of Dionysus referring to his oxen-

---

33 Hdt. 2.41, discussing the Egyptian burial of cows and oxen, seems to ignore the belief. The name of Democritus in Colum. 9.14.6 = 68 B 27a D-K *progenari posse apes iuvenco perempto Democritus et Mago nec minus Vergilius prodiderunt* is highly suspect, see A. E. Shipley, *JPhil.* 34 (1915–18), 101, A. S. F. Gow, *CR* 58 (1944), 15, D-K on Democr. Spur. 68 B 300.8.

34 ἴδια δέ etc. ἴδιος in Antigonus, as θαυμαστός or θαυμάσιος, is equivalent to παράδοξος, cf. ch.s 7, 89.1, 85, 91, 142b.2 and see *PGR*, 263, Fraser ii, 1089 n. 452. This chapter contains typical elements used by Antig. in chapters quoting lines from poetry (short description of marvel, short characterisation of the poet, short quotation), cf. ch. 7 ἴδιον δὲ καὶ τὸ περὶ τὰ ἔντερα τῶν προβάτων· τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν κριῶν ἐστιν ἄφωνα, τὰ δὲ τῶν θηλέων εὔφωνα. ὅθεν καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν ὑπολάβοι τις εἰρηκέναι, πολυπράγμονα πανταχοῦ καὶ περιττὸν ὄντα: [*HHHerm.* 51], cf. also ch. 25a and see G. Schepens in O. Pecere – A. Stramaglia (edd.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*, Cassino 1996, 383f.

like appearance, Socrates of Argos (4th cent. BC) Περὶ ὁσίων *FGrH* 310 F 2 (Plut. *Is. et Os.* 364f, cf. *Aet. gr.* 299b) Ἀργείοις δὲ βουγενὴς Διόνυσος ἐπίκλην ἐστίν, and Emped. 31 B 61.2 D-K describes a perished monstrous animal species as βουγενῆ ἀνδρόπρῳρα 'creatures with the nature of oxen and face of man'. A late source (Euseb. *Chron. Ol.* 5.2) says that Eumelus wrote a *Bugonia* (*EGF* T. 2). But P. is the first to use this term of bugony. He was followed by Call. *Aet. SH* 254.4 (re-edited in G. Massimilla, *SIFC* 91 (1998), 160–1, cf. also *ibid.* 169) Δαναοῦ . . ἀπὸ βουγενέος applied to Danaus, an offspring of Io transformed into a cow. Then Bian. *GPh* 17.2 contemptuously addresses bees as βουγενέες, cf. Anon. *AP* 9.363.13, Hsch. β 882 βουγενέων· τῶν μελισσῶν. Καλλίμαχος· [*Aet. l.c.*], καὶ ἡ μέλισσα βουγενής, ὅτι ἐκ βοείων ὀστέων γεννᾶται, Porph. *Antr. Nymph.* 15. Others created variations, as Eryc. *GPh* 11.3 βούπαισι . . μελίσσαις with G-P ad loc., Strato *AP* 12.249.1 with the rather clumsy βουποίητε μέλισσα, Theoc. *Syrinx* 3 ταυροπάτωρ with Σ ad loc. (338.10 Wendel), Archel. Chers. *SH* 127 = *FGE* 2a βοὸς φθιμένης πεπλανημένα τέκνα and cf. Nic. *Ther.* 741 ἵπποι γὰρ σφηκῶν γένεσις, ταῦροι δὲ μελισσῶν. Later Porph. *Antr. Nymph.* 18 reused the adj. in a passage bringing forward an allegorical interpretation of bugony as souls of the dead seeking their rebith so as to lead just lives. In *Geoponica* 15.2.4 βουγονής occurs.

The form has elaborate Homeric parallels that found their way into Hellenistic verse such as *Od.* 4.336 νεηγενής whence Nic. fr. 18.1, Antip. Sid. *HE* 63.1, perhaps Theodot. *SH* 759.6 and contemporary inscriptions, *GVI* 802.5 (2nd/1st cent. BC), 976.5 (2nd/3rd cent. BC), or *Il.* 2.54 Πυλοιγενής whence Euph. *SH* 428.2, cf. also *Il.* 15.171 = 19.358 αἰθρηγενής whence A.R. 4.765, or after *HHAphr.* 229 (and as a variant in *Il.* 11.427, 23.81) Theoc. 27.43 εὐηγενής. Others such as διογενής were ignored by Hellenistic poets as banal and some were modified for the sake of variation. Antim. fr. 41a.7 = *SH* 52.7 γηγενέας τε⌋ θεοὺς πρ⌊οτερηγ⌋ενέας Τιτῆνας coins προτερηγενής from Homeric παλαιγενής (still used by A.R. 1.1, 2.848, Epica Adesp. *CA* 9.ii.5, *GES* 68.6 (3rd cent. BC *ex.*)), subsequently taken up by Call. *HyJov.* 58, A.R. 4.268 where see Livrea, or A.R. 2.450, 3.824 (noun), 3.1224 (adj.) ἠριγενής after Homeric ἠριγένεια (still in Theoc. 24.39). Other -γενεσ- adjj. are Hellenistic creations, such as Call. *SH* 276.9 κυθηγενής (cf. Hsch. κ 4441 κυθηγενέεσσι· κρυφογενέσιν), Nicaenet. *CA* 1.7 ὑλιγενής, Euph. *SH* 442.29 θα]λασσογενής ~ Archestr. *SH* 187.7, A.R. 4.1641 μελιηγενής ~ Euph. *SH* 434.11, Nic. *Ther.* 874

ὀρειγενής after Moschio *TrGF* 97 F 6.5 in a different sense, Sotades *CA* 15.1 παντογενής. See in general B-P 723–4.

14.b. φθάμενος for the MS' φάμενος was first proposed by Joshua Barnes. Rohde *Kl. Schr.* ii, 310 n. 1 independently re-proposed it drawing attention to *Il.* 23.779 ὡς ἦλθε φθάμενος, cf. outside epic Eur. *Andr.* 990 μὴ φθῇ σε προσβὰς δῶμα. φάμενος is not an interpolation by Antig., as the quotation is already introduced by λέγων and as this would contradict his practice not to interpolate words of his own in his poetic quotations (conveniently gathered by O. Musso, *Prometheus* 5 (1979), 83–90). Kayser 64 ("pro solemni ὣς ἔφατο καὶ προσεβήσατο") and Bach 54 deeming its object to be "ea, quae in sententia hunc versum praecedenti dicta erant" retained it, but φάμενος without ὡς would be plainly inadmissible, cf. *Il.* 22.460 ὣς φαμένη μεγάροιο διέσσυτο and see Campbell on Q.S. 12.66. φθάμενος would refer to the dangers anticipated for a non-professional in his approaching a bee-hive. His clumsy proceedings might have led to a grotesque conclusion. φθάνω commonly appears is such contexts. Bergk printed the unappealing Φαμενός (retained by Diehl in the first edition of the *Anthol. Lyr. Gr.* ii, 213), the name of a son of Teiresias (Soph. fr. 392, Pisander *FGrH* 16 F 9, see O. Höffer in Roscher iii, 2245), which involves a needless emendation of προσεβήσαο to προσεβήσατο.

14.c. προσεβήσαο In early epic the form προσεβήσετο occurs in *Il.* 2.48, 15.292, *Od.* 21.5, 43, *HHHerm.* 99 but [Hes.] *Scut.* 33 = fr. 195.33 has προσεβήσατο. The orthodox Homeric forms are the so-called mixed Aorists ἐβήσετο, ἐδύσετο etc., which Aristarch. preferred but did not introduce them in the text.[35] In most cases the MSS offer both forms. The Alexandrines preserved the mixed forms in their texts of Homer, while themselves consistently used the 'normal' -α- endings as P. here, Simias *CA* 6.5 ἐβήσατο ~ Nic. *Alex.* 302, *Ther.* 31, Call. *HE* 3.1 and A.R. 4.1133 ἀνεύρατο on which see Pfeiffer on fr. 384.40f. *ad fin.*, or A.R. βήσατο 8x ("er kann sie nur aus einem damals gültigen Homertext bezogen haben", Leumann *Kl. Schr.*, 235 n. 1). In A.R., however, there are cases where the

[35] See Erbse on Σ *Il.* 2.35a (I.184). Modern discussions: Schwyzer i, 788, Chantraine *GH* i, 416–7, Leumann *Kl. Schr.*, 234–41, Risch 250. See also S. West on *Od.* 1.330, Hainsworth on *Od.* 6.321, Campbell on A.R. 3.291.

MSS divide between -ετο and -ατο forms, such as 1.63, 4.458, 4.1176. This divergence may be used as an argument in favour of dualism in Homer with the particular form depending upon occasional MSS support. "The possibility of 'normalisation' on an extensive scale in the MSS of Hellenistic authors cannot . . be excluded, but the -ε- readings in A.R. may equally be due to 'Homericisation', and it should be noted that developments in the *koine*, where weak aorist -α- endings were encroaching on the non-sigmatic strong aorist endings, made the Homeric mixed forms even more unusual", Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 65, see also Rengakos 1993, 103–4.

14.d. προσεβήσαο μακρά varies the Homeric formula μακρὰ βιβάς etc. (Chantraine *DE* s.v. βαίνω 4) denoting the proud gait of the heroes in the battlefield, see Janko on *Il.* 13.158 (cf. Virg. *A.* 10.572 *longe gradientem* of Aeneias), but in a non-heroic context it is transformed into a comic element, here apparently of someone taking confident steps towards a swarm of bees. The Homeric phrase is comically exploited already in *Od.* 9.450 of Polyphemus' ram prancing through the field (see M. Casevitz in *id.* 57) and in *Od.* 11.539 of Achilleus' shadow in the Underworld. — Hartung 37 conjectured προσεβώσατο which found approval with Couat 82 and von Blumenthal 2168. Aristarchus διχῶς proposed προβάοντε for προβοῶντε in *Il.* 12.277 and Zenodotus proposed βοῶν for βιβῶν in *Il.* 15.307. The emendation requires a third person singular and contradicts the ancient beliefs about the bees' capability to perceive sounds. P. is not likely to ignore Arist.'s hesitation about granting bees the gift of hearing.[36]

Fr. 15

Hesychius' lemma says that P. called the — or some of the — Coan women 'Thessalians'. The content of this reference as well as its transmission until Hesychius (see ff.) speak for attribution to *Demeter*. The fragment constitutes an unequivocal allusion to the colonisation of Cos by Thessalian tribes. The autochthonic pre-Hellenic population

---

[36] Cf. Arist. *HA* 627a17, see Davies-Kathirithamby 54–5, Mynors on Virg. *G.* 50 ("no organ of hearing has yet been identified"). Adesp. Pap. Misc. *SH* 990.2 .]κλαπακούσατε, δεῦτε, μέλισσαι summons the devotees of Demeter to listen to the hymn and on a physical level might play on that.

of Cos was called Μέροπες 'the indigenous people'.[37] The first Greek settlers were Thessalians who mixed with the aboriginal population who inhabited a scantily populated and underdeveloped island (Craik 22). There is sufficient evidence to posit a pre-Dorian movement from Thessaly to some of the Aegean islands, such as common place- and person-names or common cult-practices. In the case of Cos common toponyms, as Pele and Oromedon, and common names of leading figures such as Eurypylus, king of Thessaly in *Il.* 2.734–7 and legendary ruler of Cos in *Il.* 2.676–80, speak for an early association.[38] A honorary decree for Athenagoras of Larisa dated at 168 BC and found at the Asclepieum mentions τὰν]συγγένειαν καὶ τὰν Κῴων [ποτὶ τὸς Θεσ]|σαλὸς ἐκτένειαν (published in Hallof – Habicht 105f., see esp. 108–9).

The Greek settlers brought with them elements of their advanced civilisation. So the 'Thessalian' era could be considered as a time in which the Coan population improved their standard of living. The foundation of Bourina with all its significance, and the institution of apiculture (see fr. 14) are linked to this time. In P. cf. that a Thessalian town may be at work in *Inc. sed.* fr. 28. It is probable that the institution of Demeter's cult on the fringes of the SE Aegean and in Caria is to be referred to the days of the Thessalian colonisation (cf. Steph. Byz. 256.14 s.v. Δώτιον), which brought about the introduction of the cult of Asclepius (Herodas 2.97) and of other Greek deities such as Poseidon, whose worship blossomed in the islands (Craik 183). The cult of Demeter in fertile Cos was then endorsed by the majority Dorian population as happened in other places of Dorian dominance with an established pre-Dorian worship of Demeter (Nilsson 1967, 463). A distinguished cult-site of Demeter in the neighbour-

---

[37] P. might have discussed the term in *At. Gl.* (*All. Gramm. Ascr.* Dub. 1). The name seems pre-Hellenic and non-Greek, as Δόλοπες, Δρύοπες etc., see Sh-W 47 n. 95, Chantraine *DE* s.v. μέροψ. On Coans as Meropes see Wil. *Kl. Schr.* i, 144, Herzog 170–2, G-P on Meleag. *HE* 3.4, H. Koller, *Glotta* 46 (1968), 23f., Sh-W 47–50, S. Jackson, *ZPE* 110 (1996), 44 n. 9.

[38] See Paton in P-H xiv–xv and 344–8 (Appendix F: "Connection of Cos with Southern Thessaly"), Wil. 1886, 52–4, *id.* 1931/32 i, 81–2, Herzog 172f., Sh-W 17–8 with n. 36, Craik 163–4. This link with Thessaly might have been sustained by current relations as well. A 3rd cent. BC inscription from Cos (*IdC* ED 48) reports imports of grain from Thessaly, see M. Segre, *RFIC* 12 (1934), 169–93. Coan doctors regularly offered their services in Thessaly and Cos was asked to send *theôroi* to the Thessalian festival of Athena Itonias (see Sh-W 110 n. 142 and p. 114 respectively).

ing Cnidian peninsula, the Triopion, named after its founder Triops, the leader of the Thessalian migrants, is associated with Cos by its mythical homonymous king (on whom cf. Σ Theoc. 17.68/69b (321.18 Wendel) and see Sh-W 192 with n. 103).

The second part of the lemma gives a clue as to the context in *Demeter*. Thessalian women were celebrated witches, see G-P on Anon. *HE* 35.6, N-H on Hor. *C.* 1.27.21 and cf. Sosiph. *TrGF* 92 F 1.1 μάγοις ἐπῳδαῖς πᾶσα Θεσσαλὶς κόρη, Ar. *Nub.* 749–50. Σ on Ar. *l.l.* (157.1 Koster) suggest that this was a long-lasting reputation (καὶ μέχρι νῦν δὲ φαρμακίδες παρ' ἡμῖν αἱ Θετταλαὶ καλοῦνται) and link it with Medea's occult capabilities, but Dodds on Plato *Gorg.* 513a5–6 was probably right to connect this reputation with the widespread cult of Hecate in Thessaly. *Campbell saw as a possible application, a reference to Medea's activities as a witch in a broader Argonautic context, *cll.* Pind. *P.* 4.233 παμφαρμάκου ξείνας, A.R. 4.52–3 οἷα γυναῖκες/φαρμακίδες, Strabo 1.2.39 ἥ τε Μήδεια φαρμακὶς ἱστορεῖται. However, there is no Coan connection to this possibility. Bach 74 concluded that "mulierum veneficarum genus olim apud Coos fuisse videtur" and Sh-W 309 regarded it as "very possible" that P. dealt with Mestra pharmakis, the Thessalian sorceress who gave birth to the Coan king Eurypylus on Cos (Hes. *Cat.* fr. 43a.66–8). To judge from Theoc. 2.90–1 some elderly Coan ladies performed incantations, although in ancient sources Coan witches did not have a name. An allusion to the 'Thessalian' Coan women as witches due to their association with Mestra is conceivable in P. This piece of information would as well serve to indicate the ultimate source of this reference as a Σ on Theoc. 7, which would relate the appellation of Coan women as Θεσσαλαί in P. with the content of some passage in that poem (126–7 γραία τε παρείη/ἅτις ἐπιφθύζοισα τὰ μὴ καλὰ νόσφιν ἐρύκοι?). This would also point towards placing this fragment in *Demeter*. Demeter's link with magic lies above all in the field of medicine, cf. her treatment of Demophon in *HHD* 239f. It is possible that a seriously sick child featured in *Demeter* (see p. 237f.) and this characterisation might refer to the failed efforts by elderly Coan women to make it well before the goddess took over its procurement.

Fr. 16

This marginal Σ on the gloss ἄεμμα casts light on the background of Call.'s employment of this term in *HyAp.* 33. Its affinity with Hsch.

α 1363 shows that Diogenianus draws on a Σ on that Callimachean line and the entry in its original form would be likely to contain the reference to P. The way the Σ is preserved on the 6th/7th cent. AD papyrus does not allow certainty about metrical form. The editors of *SH* postulated a pentameter ("fort. pentameter"). If the gaps are correctly supplemented in the first two lines, the gap in the third should be quite short as well. E. Livrea, *Gnomon* 75 (1985), 597 placed γυμνὸν ἄεμμα "potius in fine hexametri" *cl.* Call. *HyArt.* 10 εὐκαμπὲς ἄεμμα/. This cannot be ruled out, but even if compatible with the gaps, it derives little support from the Callimachean clausula, as that is meant to vary καμπύλα τόξα/, which is 5x clausular in Homer. *A. S. Hollis has considered restoring this fragment as the end of a pentameter followed by the beginning of a hexameter αὐτὰρ ὅ γε/ e.g. <εἴλκυσε> γυμνὸν ἄεμμα, as is the line division in the marginal Σ, *cl.* Posid. *SH* 705.21–2 αὐτὰρ ἐγώ/γήραϊ μυστικὸν οἶμον etc. ~ Simon. *IEG* 11.20, Call. *Aet.* fr. 24.6 (ἄκαιναν) ὅγε/. γυμνόν would make better sense as a predicate accusative and his supplement <εἴλκυσε> would gain in probability if P. conflates here the wounding of Eurypylus, the Thessalian ancestor of the homonym Coan king, by Paris in *Il.* 11.581f. τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόησεν 'Αλέξανδρος θεοειδής/... αὐτίκα τόξον/ἕλκετ' (: εἷλκεν *v.l.*) ἐπ' Εὐρυπύλῳ, καί μιν βάλε etc.

Who is likely to be holding a bow in *Demeter*? The Philitan phrase varies a Homeric one picked up from a passage on Heracles, *Od.* 11.606–8 ὁ δ' ἐρεμνῇ νυκτὶ ἐοικώς,/*γυμνὸν τόξον* ἔχων καὶ ἐπὶ νευρῆφιν ὀιστόν,/δεινὸν παπταίνων, αἰεὶ βαλέοντι ἐοικώς. Σ Theoc. 7.5–9f (79.6 Wendel; Chalcon and Antagoras) οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς 'Ηρακλέους πολιορκίας τὴν Κῶ κατοικήσαντες καὶ ὑποδεδεγμένοι τὴν Δήμητραν etc., which possibly summarises *Demeter*, link Chalcon and Antagoras' reign with Heracles' siege of Cos and the reception of Demeter. This suggests that P. in *Demeter* treated Heracles' proceedings in Cos and this fragment may be derived from this episode. The 3rd person narration (αὐτὰρ ὅ γε) would suggest that of the two persons likely to hold a bow in *Demeter* (Chalcon, who injured Heracles, or, as in *Od. l.c.*, Heracles himself) the latter is preferable. P. might have reproduced the grotesque effect of the unprovokedly on the alert, almost panic-stricken Odyssean Heracles. γυμνόν already suggests readiness for a warlike involvement.

Heracles' advent on Cos is well established in epic poetry and mythological tradition. The poet of the *Iliad* knows of a tradition

according to which Heracles' life was at risk in Cos so that Zeus had to rescue him and get him safely back to Argos (*Il.* 15.24f.), but the circumstances are not clear. Later information known to [Apollod.] 2.7.1 (perhaps from Pherecydes, see M. van der Valk, *REG* 71 (1958), 150–1) clarifies that ἐτρώθη δὲ κατὰ τὴν μάχην Ἡρακλῆς ὑπὸ Χαλκώδοντος, καὶ Διὸς ἐξαρπάσαντος αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ἔπαθε. In relation to this, Σ Theoc. 7.130–1d (109.22 Wendel) supply the information that the Coan deme of Pyxa was named after Heracles' flight when the Coans launched a sudden attack on him: <Πύξα: δῆμος τῆς Κῶ> (suppl. Ahrens) φύξα τις ὤν· ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ ἔφυγεν Ἡρακλῆς αἴφνης ἐπιθεμένων αὐτῷ τῶν Κῴων, cf. Σ *ibid.* 130–1e (110.1 Wendel) παρὰ τὴν φύξιν [note this rare poetic word] τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Κῴων γενομένην.[39] Pyxa (modern Asphendiou) lies some 6.5 km SW of the Coan capital, see Gow on Theoc. 7.130, Sh-W 59. φύζα, which the Coans referred to Heracles, is a disreputable term applying to the panic flight of the cowards. Aristarchus noted that it is used ἐπὶ τῆς μετὰ δειλίας φυγῆς, see Erbse on Σ *Il.* 9.2b (II.394). This may imply a passage with grotesque overtones.

The piece of information about Pyxa seems to have been supplied by Nicanor, the Coan commentator of P., and to have been perpetuated through Theon.[40] Nicanor is mentioned by name in Σ Theoc. 7.5–9k in connection with Bourina (fr. 6) and he is likely to have been the source of information on other Coan localities too in the extant Σ on Theoc. 7. However, as Pfeiffer ii, xxix suggested (see also Hollis 1990, 37) the immediate source of POxy. 2258A transmitting this fragment may be Salustius, an undated commentator of Callimachus (Wil. suggested a 4th/5th cent. AD date). Here Nicanor is probably commenting on a Philitan passage describing the victorious Coan assault on Heracles in Pyxa. P. would not treat the full story but would focus on the episode in Pyxa drawing attention to Heracles' humiliating defeat by legendary Coan leaders.

---

[39] See Arnott 1979, 102, Zanker 1980, 374. Local inscriptions and the popular etymology suggest Φύξα. All MSS in Theoc. 7.136 and *HG* 16.11–2 (3rd cent. BC) transmit Πύξα which Wil. 1924 ii, 138 regarded as a deliberate change of Theoc. The original form is Πύξα from the plant πύξος 'box' occurring mainly in Asia Minor, see *HG*, 41. On the etymology of πύξος, for which Boisacq had suggested a Micrasiatic origin on the basis of its geographical distribution, see S. Amigues in *Phytonymes*, 9–16 (with photos), Y. Duhoux in *ibid.*, 109.

[40] See P-H 356, C. Wendel, *RE* XVII.1.273 s.v. Nikanor (25), Weingarth 56f., K. Spanoudakis in G. M. Sifakis (ed.), *Κτερίσματα. Φιλολογικά Μελετήματα αφιερωμένα στον Ιω. Σ. Καμπίτση*, Heraklion 2000, 326f.

P. might have had additional reasons to discuss Heracles' advent on Cos. The Coan version of the episode ended in a conciliatory marriage between him and Eurypylus' daughter, Chalciope, which produced Thessalus as an offspring (*Il.* 2.679 with Σ on 677 (I.322 Erbse), Plut. *Quaest. gr.* 304d), thus founding a new dynasty and making Coan nobles proud of their very Greek pedigree. An inscription of the 1st cent. AD (*IdC* EV 224) shows that some Coans traced their noble ancestry back to Heracles with a precise computation of the generations elapsed, see G. Pugliese-Caratelli, "ΑΠΟΓΟΝΟΙ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΥΣ" in *Studi Gigante*, 543–7 and cf., analogously, Call. fr. 75.50f. on the Acontiadai, a powerful family in 3rd cent. BC Ioulis.

On what occasion would Heracles' advent to Cos be treated in *Demeter*? The story is singled out in Σ Theoc. 7.5–9f and the exposition of this event may have occupied a central place in the poem between the *locus amoenus* at Bourina and the banquet at Chalcon's palace. Perhaps it covered the itinerary of Demeter and Chalcon from Bourina to the Coan palace as they approached Pyxa, cf. Lycidas (in many respects embodying Philitan Demeter) in Theoc. 7.130–1 χὠ μὲν ἀποκλίνας ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τὰν ἐπὶ Πύξας/εἷρφ' ὁδόν.

16.a. αὐτὰρ ὅ γε usually refers to what precedes and is only rarely prospective, see Gow on Theoc. 7.94f. It signifies a new turn in an episode in progress. αὐτάρ is epic, "adversative" or "weakly adversative, or purely progressive", Denniston 55.

16.b. γυμνὸν ἄεμμα varies *Od.* 11.607 /γυμνὸν τόξον ἔχων in a passage describing Heracles as Odysseus met him in Hades. Cf. on 'nude' weapons *Od.* 21.416–7 ὀιστόν, ὅς οἱ παρέκειτο τραπέζῃ/γυμνός, Pind. *N.* 1.52, A.R. 1.1254 γυμνὸν . . . ξίφος ~ 4.465 and Nonn. *D.* 22.160, 306, Theoc. 22.146, Xen. *Ag.* 2.14, Aen. Tact. 27.9, and see Livrea on A.R. 4.465, *DGE* s.v. I.1 *ad fin.* and cf. *OLD* s.v. nudus (6). With γυμνόν 'out of its bow-case' contrast *Od.* 21.53–4 τόξον/αὐτῷ γωρυτῷ, Antim. *Artemis* fr. 108 with Matthews ad loc. and F-G 137–8.

16.c. ἄεμμα First in P. whence Call. applies it to two famous archers, *HyAp.* 33 to Apollo and *HyArt.* 10 to Artemis. It subsequently disappears, see Schmitt 102 n. 15, Williams on Call. *HyAp.* 33. K. Kuiper (*Studia Callimachea* i, Leiden 1896, 51) first sensed a Cretan origin for the word. Cretans were famous archers (N-H on Hor. *C.* 1.15.17) and Kuiper's intuition derives support from Call.

HE 61.1 where a Cretan archer Ἐχέμμας = ὃς ἔχει ἄεμμα appears,[41] cf. also Call. *HyAp.* 33 ἄεμμα τὸ Λύκτιον = τὸ Κρητικόν.[42] The term is related to ἅμμα 'cord'. Interestingly, the wife of Merops and mother of Cos was called Ἐχέμεια (or *Ethemeia*), a Nymph of exceptional beauty whose fate was, in a way, similar to Persephone's, as she was targeted — ironically — by the arrows of Artemis when she neglected the goddess and was eventually abducted to Hades by Persephone while she was still alive.[43]

Fr. 17

The line owes its survival to the artificial abbreviation of ἔριον to ἔρι, cf. αἰδῶ in fr. 5. Strabo, in a long extract from Apollodorus of Athens containing this fragment, quotes many examples of apocope (Arist.'s *Poet.* 1458a4 ἀφῃρημένον ὄνομα) from Homer (κρῖ, δῶ, μάψ) and Hesiod to Antimachus, Euphorion, Aratus and Simias, see Schwyzer i, 16 n. 1.

The fragment varies *Il.* 18.567–8 παρθενικαὶ δὲ καὶ ἠίθεοι . . ./πλεκτοῖς ἐν ταλάροισι φέρον μελιηδέα καρπόν, cf. for similar images *Od.* 4.124f., [Hes.] *Scut.* 293–4, [Opp.] *Cyn.* 2.41–2, *Anacreont.* 59.1–3, and it is then echoed in Call. *Aet.* fr. 178.1–2 (an Athenian in Alexandria celebrates Anthesteria) ὅτε δούλοις/ἦμαρ Ὀρέστειοι λευκὸν ἄγουσι χόες/. The pentameter may belong to *Demeter* as it refers to

---

[41] The intended pun was first noticed by K. Ziegler, *RPh* 77 (1938), 79–80. Ἐχέμμας is in fact a Dorian diminutive of Ἐχεμένης, see Masson i, 263–4.

[42] Glosses from Doric Crete would come as no surprise in P., cf., perhaps, ὀρόδαμνος > Hsch. ο 1275 ὀρόδεμνιάδες. The Cretan dialect elicited some attention from contemporary scholars. Arist. *Poet.* 1461a9 adduces a Cretan gloss to interpret Homeric εἶδος. Simias fr. 32 Fränkel (*CA* 27) discusses the name of a fish in the dialect of Crete, Posid.? Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 961.5 employs a Cretan gloss and δρόμος 'gymnasium' in Call. *Hec.* fr. 71.3 is said to be Cretan too. Hermonax, an Alexandrian? scholar known only from Athenaeus, is said to have written Κρητικαὶ γλῶσσαι, 3.76e, *al.*

[43] Cf. on her Eur. *Hel.* 381f. (involving her metamorphosis in χρυσοκέρατ' ἔλαφον . . ./καλλοσύνας ἕνεκεν), EtM 507.55, Hyg. *Astr.* 2.16 *Ethemeia.* These may suggest a Hellenistic treatment, perhaps in one of the many Hellenistic Φαινόμενα-poems. See H. Dibbelt, *Quaestiones Coae mythologae*, Greifswald 1891, 16, Escher, *RE* V.2.1912–13, S. Jackson, *ZPE* 110 (1996), 45. Jackson suggested that Echemeia's neglect of Artemis may be related to a tradition that the statue of Apollo in Delos (cf. Call. fr. 114.4–17) was set up by the Meropian Coans, cf. Anticlides (4th cent. BC) *FGrH* 140 F 14 = Istrus Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπιφάνειαι *FGrH* 334 F 52 οὕτω δὲ παλαιόν ἐστι τὸ ἀφίδρυμα τοῦτο, ὥστε τοὺς ἐργασαμένους αὐτὸ τῶν καθ' Ἡρακλέα Μερόπων εἶναι [Μερ. del. Volkmann].

wool, an outstanding Coan product of cultic significance, and as it means to portray a well-known rite in the cult of Demeter.

The image described here would resemble a procession such as those taking place in honour of the goddess in which baskets containing ritual objects (and wool?)[44] were carried. The scene is prefigured in *HHD* 169–70 (Celeus' daughters) ταὶ δὲ φαεινά/πλησάμεναι ὕδατος φέρον ἄγγεα κυδιάουσαι, cf. then the κάλαθος in Call. *HyDem.* 1, 3, 120 and see Hopkinson 1984, 41–2 *cl.* *LSCG* 65.29–30 (Andania, *c.* 92 BC) ταῦτα αἱ παρθένοι αἱ ἱεραὶ καθὼς ἂν λάχωντι, ἄγουσαι τὰ ἅρματα ἐπικειμένας κίστας ἐχούσας ἱερὰ μυστικά. Add Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 89 (Paros), *LSAM* 61.6–7 (Mylasa, 3rd cent. BC; Demeter-cult) τὴν ἀγαφο[ρὰν τοῦ καλάθου]/[ἐπιτ]ρέπεσθαι ταῖς ἱερείαις καὶ ἐπειδὰν ἀ[νεχθῇ . . ./[τ]αῖς ἱερείαις παραδιδόναι with Sokolowski ad loc. referring to an Athenian law (Buresch, *Ath. Mitt.* (1895), 242 vv. 11f.) evidencing a κάλαθος-procession εἰς τὰς ἐπιθυσίας τῆς Δήμητρος in Athens (Σ Ψ on Call. *HyDem.* (II.77 Pf.) allege that Ptolemy Philadelphus established the procession of κάλαθος in Alexandria κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν Ἀθηνῶν), and Nonn. *D.* 13.188–9 οἵ τ' ἔχον . . Ἐλευσινίην χθόνα Δηοῦς/μυστιπόλοι ταλάροιο καὶ εὐκάρποιο θεαίνης, 31.69 τάλαρον Δήμητρος, cf. *ibid.* 6.140–1.[45] This was practiced in Cos too. Sh-W 310 n. 181 refers to *Gr. Coins Brit. Mus., Caria* p. 216 n. 217, plate xxxiii 8, "a Coan bronze of Imperial date, bearing on the reverse a *kalathos* containing a poppy-head and two ears of corn with a torch on either side, all attributes of Demeter", cf. also Theoc. 2.66 (apparently located at Cos) καναφόρος . . Ἀναξώ in the cult of Artemis.

Demeter regionally enjoyed a cult as goddess of flocks and pasture (ταυροφόρος and μηλοφόρος, cf. Call. *HyDem.* 136) and a Coan ὕπαρνος ποίμνη may have featured in *Demeter*. Sacrifices of ὄις τέλεως καὶ τελέα κυόεσσα in honour of Demeter are recorded in Cos, *HG* 1A.59–60, 8.iiib.25 (both 4th cent. BC), see Nilsson 1967, 151, Bodson 123 n. 21, van Straten 79 with n. 218. Wool appears in *HHD* 191 with a purificatory power and a ram-fleece played a similar part in

---

[44] Burkert 1983, 272 deduced that the Eleusinian κίστη contained wool from the mystic *synthema*: ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης, *ἐργασάμενος* ἐπεθέμην εἰς κάλαθον καὶ ἐκ καλάθου εἰς κίστην (Clem. *Protr.* 2.21.1). Polemo fr. 88 Preller (Athen. 11.478c–d) says that ὄιον ἔριον ἄπλυτον was carried in the *kernos*, see Pley 27.

[45] See Vian on 27.285–6. On the procession of κάλαθος in honour of Demeter, widely practised in Asia Minor, see Nilsson 1906, 350–2, Burkert 1983, 270 n. 20, *id.* 1985, 286 and on its relation to purity see Parker 1983, 79–81.

the initiation process at the Eleusinian mysteries (Burkert 1985, 286). Wool was an offering to Demeter in Phigalia, Paus. 8.42.11 ἐρίων τὰ μὴ ἐς ἐργασίαν πω ἥκοντα ἀλλὰ ἔτι ἀνάπλεα τοῦ οἰσύπου . . . καθέστηκεν ἐς τὴν θυσίαν, and in Stiris, Paus. 10.35.10, see Pley 26f. Besides, Persephone appears particularly concerned with weaving, esp. in the Sicilian and Orphic versions: in the Sicilian grove where she hides she busies herself with wool-working (Nonn. *D.* 6.146) and Demeter donates her loom to Melisseus' daughters in Paros (Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 89), cf. also Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 164(3.4), *OrphF* 33, 50, Porph. *Antr. Nymph.* 14, see Gruzelier on Claud. *RP* 1.246f., Chuvin on Nonn. *D.* 6.150–4. *LSCG* 168.5, 8 (1st/2nd cent. BC) evidences that the production of wool in Cos was taxed.[46]

The scene described in this fragment might have occurred in Chalcon's palace. Servants and slaves are a *sine qua non* of an insight into a palace, cf. e.g. Antim. *Thebaid* frr. 20–1 or A.R. 3.254f., 271f. Weaving wool or spinning constituted one of the main duties of female servants (A. Forbes, *TAPA* 86 (1955), 330–1). The weaving of wool is a favourite domestic activity in Homer (cf. *Il.* 3.125, 6.456, 12.433–5, 16.491–2, *al.*, *Od.* 7.235, 19.138–40, *al.*) and it is not rare in Hellenistic verse, cf. Erinna *SH* 401.29, Call. fr. 520 with Pfeiffer ad loc., A.R. 3.291, 4.1062, Theoc. 15.80, 28.1, Alex. Aet. *CA* 3.4, Leon. Tar. *HE* 72, Antip. Sid. *HE* 5, see G. Huber, *Lebensschilderung und Kleinmalerei im hellenistischen Epik*, Solothurn 1926, 48–50, Campbell on A.R. 3.291f., Magnelli on Alex. Aet. fr. 3.4.

17.a. δμωίδες is an elaboration of the Homeric δμωή which perhaps means to imply here the notion of youth as it was young maidens who carried the sacred basket in processions. It first occurs in Aeschylean lyrics (4x, see Hutchinson on *ScTh* 363), Eur. 9x, then P., A.R. 1.285, Lyc. 1123 (adj.), Hagias and Dercyl. *FGrH* 305 F 4, trivialised in Roman times, Plut. *Cam.* 33.4, Q.S. 3x, *GVI* 459.1, Nonn. *D.* 13x and *Par. Jo.* 18.78. δμωίς is formed on Homeric nouns such as κληΐς etc. (not very many in Homer), see Chantraine *GH* i,

[46] On wool in Cos see Rostovtzeff i, 240, Sh-W 231. Cf. Crates fr. 53 Mette φησὶ καὶ τὴν Κῶν, 'τὴν ἐπιτηδείαν πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα', τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας Κᾶρας οὕτως ὀνομάσαι τῇ οἰκείᾳ φωνῇ· 'κῶν' γὰρ τὸ πρόβατον ὀνομάζουσιν. On wool's cathartic power see n. c and Richardson 1974, 212, Parker 1983, 229. On Demeter as goddess of flocks see Farnell iii, 313–4 nn. 10–4 with the reservations noted in pp. 32–3.

207–8, *id.* 1933, 337–9, Risch 141–2, Russo on *Od.* 19.518 on hapax adj. χλωρηίς. As Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 94 noted, these are a feature of Doric poetic vocabulary. Their frequency in Theoc. 7 may suggest that P. affected them. — Many of these forms are coinages of tragedy taken up in Hellenistic verse, such as κρηνίς after Eur. *Hipp.* 208 in Theoc. 1.22, Alc. Mess. *HE* 12.2, [Call.] *Fr. inc. auct.* 751, παρηίς after Aesch. *Choeph.* 24, *al.* in A.R. 3.1064, 4.1066. Others are Homeric hapaxes, such as πλημμυρίς from *Od.* 9.486 in A.R. 2.576, 4.1241, 1269, Philo Jud. *SH* 686.5 or ἀχερωίς from *Il.* 13.389 in A.R. 4.1476. Others are coined and confined in Hellenistic poetry, e.g. ἀλσηίδες in A.R. 1.1066, 4.1151, λεχωίς in Call. *HyDian.* 127, *HyDel.* 56, 124, A.R. 4.136 where see Livrea, πλοκαμίς after Men. *PCG* fr. 568, in Theoc. 13.7, Euph. *CA* 94.3, *HE* 1.3, see Reed on Bion *EA* 20, from Homeric hapax πλόκαμος (on which see Livrea on A.R. 4.19), or ποταμηίς in A.R. 3.1219, Nic. *Alex.* 128. Euph. *CA* 8 turns the town Ἀλύβη (*Il.* 2.857) into Ἀλυβηίς and Erat. *CA* 5 the town Ἀπία into Ἀπίς. A list of such forms in Call. is provided in Schmitt 22–6, see also Williams on *HyAp.* 48 and in general B-P 416f., M. Meier, *-ιδ: Zur Geschichte eines griechischen Nominalsuffixes*, Göttingen 1975.

17.b. ταλάρους τάλαρος is the spinning basket used both before and after spinning, cf. Leon. Tar. *HE* 42.4 εἰροκόμον τάλαρον and see Gow on Theoc. 18.32, G-P on Antip. Sid. *HE* 4.5f. with reference to Hsch. κ 393 κάλαθος· . . . γυναικεῖον σκεῦος εἰς ἐρίων παράθεσιν. Here it is used with its cultic associations as the sacred basket of Demeter. It is an object often associated with the dutiful toils of women. In *GVI* 1881.7 (1st/2nd cent. BC) a τάλαρος depicted on a woman's tomb is εὐτάκτου . . ἀρετᾶς . . μάνυμα, cf. Nonn. *D.* 20.245–6 δμωὶς . . . Παλλάδι . . ./. . ταλάροισι and see C. Dobias-Lalou, *REG* 95 (1982), 47–8 for other inscriptional evidence.

17.c. λευκόν is here an adj. with cultic significance. In *HHD* 191f. Demeter refuses to sit down until Iambe fetches a stool and καθύπερθε δ' ἐπ' ἀργύφεον βάλε κῶας (196). 'White' implies purity and is therefore particularly appropriate of Demeter.[47] In Pind. *O.* 6.95 Hieron

[47] On white as colour of chastity see G. Radke, *Die Bedeutung der weißen und der schwarzen Farbe in Kult und Brauch der Griechen*, Diss. Jena 1936, 57–63 and on white garments prescribed in ritual see Wächter 16–9. On Demeter's white see Richardson on *HHD* 42f., Hopkinson 1984, 40 and on the *Graeco ritu* Roman cult-practices

ἀμφέπει Δάματρα λευκίππου τε θυγατρὸς ἑορτάν and in Call. *HyDem.* 120 the sacred basket is carried by λευκότριχες ἵπποι, cf. also 122 (Demeter) λευκὸν ἔαρ, λευκὸν δὲ θέρος καὶ χεῖμα φέρουσα, Ov. *F.* 4.619–20 *alba decent Cererem: vestis Cerialibus albas/sumite; nunc pulli velleris usus abest*, *Met.* 10.431–5. According to Paus. 2.25.5, a group of children in the procession in honour of Demeter in Hermione wear λευκὴν ἐσθῆτα, cf. also Cypriot Philios in *CEG* 54.3 (Priene, *c.* 350 BC) seeing in a dream Θεσμοφόρους τε ἁγνὰς ποτνίας ἐμ φάρεσι λεοκοῖς and *LSCG* 68.17–9 (Lycosura, 3rd cent. BC) τὸς δὲ θ[ύ]|οντας τᾷ Δεσ̣ποίνᾳ θύματα θύ[ην]| θήλεα λευκ[ά.

17.d. λευκὸν . . ἔρι is perhaps an echo of *HHD* 309, 452 (after *Il.* 5.196, *al.*) κρῖ λευκόν, cf. Antim. fr. 49.1 = *SH* 61.1]κριλ̣[, further *HHD* 208 ἄλφι whence Antim. fr. 145. The construction is unHomeric and a novelty on the whole. Possession of wool is a typical indication of luxury and wealth, cf. Hes. *WD* 234 and see Pley 67–79. By common knowledge it was flocks that rendered their owners wealthy, see Matthews on Antim. fr. 61 πολλὰ δὲ μῆλα, τά περ ἀφνήμονας ἄνδρας <ἔθηκεν> (suppl. Bergk) (add *Od.* 19.113, Hes. fr. 10a.39 ἀ̣φ[ν]ειὸς μ̣ήλο̣[ισι). The quality of the wool was defined among others by its whiteness, cf. Strabo 6.3.9 *ad fin.*, Martial 14.155, Colum. 7.2.3–5 and the advice of Virg. G. 3.386 *continuoque greges villis lege mollibus albos.* On the collective singular ἔρι(ον) see K-G i, 13.

17.e. ἄγουσιν ἔρι is a pentameter clausula in the style of Call., cf. *Aet.* frr. 41.3 ἄγουσι θύρην/, 43.41 ἄγουͅσι ν̣έα/, 178.2 ἄγουσι χόες/, *SH* 259.20].αγωσιν ἔπι/, Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 966.16 (Parth.?)]αγουσινεοι/. The use of ἄγω governing an inanimate object was controversial in antiquity. Where the verb means 'carry' it is normally used of living creatures, φέρω being used of things. The *locus classicus* for their distinction is *Il.* 23.512–3 δῶκε δ' ἄγειν ἑτάροισιν ὑπερθύμοισι γυναῖκα/καὶ τρίποδ' ὠτώεντα φέρειν. P. probably makes a philological point, particularly if he has *Il.* 18.567–8 in mind. Aristarchus eventually issued a verdict that ἄγω cannot govern an inanimate object, traces of which are often found in the Σ,[48] but P.

Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 10.431f. For the excellence of white wool see Blümner i, 100, Orth, *RE* XII.1.596–7, G. M. Frayn, *Sheep-Rearing and the Wool Trade in Italy during the Roman Period*, Liverpool 1984, 28–44. Cf. the 'bright wool' in Aesch. *Eum.* 45, Soph. *Trach.* 675.

[48] See Ebeling s.v. ἄγω A.9, Erbse on Σ A *Il.* 11.632b (III.245) <ὃ οἴκοθεν ἦγ' ὁ γεραιός:> ὅτι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἤγαγεν κατὰ μεταφορὰν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμψύχων, van der Valk

was right in asserting the opposite. One wonders if this controversy would become an issue in Aristarchus' Πρὸς Φιλίταν.

Fr. 18

In this pentameter someone is said to use such an effective mode of fishing that not even the δυσθήρατος hyces managed to escape. Coan waters were teeming with fish and fishing was of much importance to the Coan economy, as to any other of the neighbouring islands (see Craik 15). At a period of famine, *Demeter* seems to have insisted on non-cereal means of nutrition and epic tradition suggests that fishing could have been mentioned in this respect. Hyces in particular, so despised by Demeter, is likely to have come up in P.'s subversive poem. The Callimachean context in the transmission of this fragment (> Hermippus) also points to *Demeter.*

Orthodox heroic diet values meat and rejects fish.[49] Menelaus' starving companions in *Od.* 4.368–9 resort to fishing when all other means of nutrition are exhausted: αἰεὶ γὰρ περὶ νῆσον ἀλώμενοι ἰχθυάασκον/γναμπτοῖς ἀγκίστροισιν, ἔτειρε δὲ γαστέρα λιμός, cf. also *Od.* 12.32. The all-catching method of fishing envisaged in this fragment may imply fishing-nets, cf. Herodas 3.20 of a Coan fisherman practising his profession δικτύοις. It seems to view fishing as a means of living. This might have been necessitated by Demeter's famine. As with the companions of Menelaus in the *Od.*, the sterility of the Coan land would make the Coans turn to alternative ways of nutrition. We do not know who would actually fish in *Demeter*, but if it was Chalcon, the reference would be designed to be grotesque as fishing was regarded throughout antiquity as a humble and contemptuous activity. As perhaps in fr. 14 with the bees, Chalcon would be involved in a scene of comic overtones.

Hyces' sanctity is propounded by Call. *HE* 65a, b θεὸς δέ οἱ ἱερὸς ὕκης which seems to imply that hyces is a sacred fish according to the judgement or belief of someone or some group of people (οἱ).

---

on Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 57.14 (I.91), *LfrE* s.v. ἄγω I.1, Janko on *Il.* 16.221–4. There is a similar case in Hermesian. *CA* 7.63–4 ὑπὸ σκολιοῖο τυπέντα/τόξου, as Aristarchus claimed that τύπτω is used in Homer for hitting at short range, βάλλω for hitting at long range (Lehrs 52f., Erbse (I.537) on Σ *Il.* 4.540).

[49] Cf. Plato *Rep.* 3.404b–c, Athen. 1.24f–25f. See Schmidt 182–7, Parker 1983, 360, Hunter on Eubul. *PCG* 118 (his fr. 120).

Athen. 7.327a quotes the Callimachean fragment in his hyces-entry together with the line of P. Hyces was commonly identified with the erythrinos, cf. Zenod. *Ethnikai lexeis* pp. 174–5 Pusch *ap.* Athen. 7.327b (see Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 659 n. 65), whom follows Clitarch in Athen. 7.300f, and via Pamphilus Hsch. υ 139 ὕκος· ἐρυθρῖνος. This view is probably also shared by Numenius of Heraclea who, in the surviving fragments of *Halieutica* (*SH* 568–588), mentions ioulis (*SH* 583.1, 584.2) and hyces (see n. a) twice each but never erythrinos. Hyces and erythrinos mutually exclude each other in authors of such broad scope as Oppian. Athenaeus seems to be the only exception as he discusses each name in different entries (erythrinos in 7.300e-f), but his distinction carries little weight as he lacks technical knowledge and relies entirely on his glossographic sources.

Hermippus of Smyrna, a grammarian of the later 3rd cent. BC, tried to cast doubt on this identification by equating hyces with ioulis (*FGrH* 1026 F 55 = fr. 93 Wehrli). Hermippus is three times called ὁ Καλλιμάχειος in Athenaeus (*FGrH* 1026 T 2a) and his hyces-discussion may be due to the occurrences of the gloss in Call. The fact that he discussed a Philitan line in this context further suggests dependence of the Cyrenean on the Coan. Hermippus often produced individual theories (see H. Gärtner, *KlP* II.1079 s.v. Hermippus (2)) and this seems to be another one of his eccentricities. There is no word of hyces in Athenaeus' ioulis-entry and in his hyces-entry ὕκην *ἀκούει* τὴν ἰουλίδα 'takes as to mean, understands', a term used in the ancient Σ to refer to peculiar interpretations,[50] indicates that this is only his personal opinion. It is unlikely that P. would espouse such an identification. Athenaeus' wording (εἶναι δ' αὐτὴν (*sc.* τὴν ἰουλίδα) δυσθήρατον. διὸ καὶ Φιλίταν φάναι etc.) might be said to imply that, but this is due to the fact that his source draws on Hermippus. Zenodotus' testimony is of decisive importance here.

Aristotle does not discuss or mention hyces and most probably he had not heard of that name, but he treats both erythrinos and ioulis. Arist. talks about erythrinos' asexuality: εἰσὶ δὲ τῶν ἰχθύων οἱ μὲν πλεῖστοι ἄρρενες καὶ θήλεις, περὶ δ' ἐρυθρίνου καὶ χάννης ἀπορεῖται· πάντες γὰρ ἁλίσκονται κυήματα ἔχοντες, *HA* 567a26–8. In 538a18–9

---

[50] See *DGE* s.v. ἀκούω I.3, cf. Plato *Prot.* 341c (Pittacus' misunderstanding of Simonides' poem) ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος etc., and in Athen. e.g. 7.327c ἄλλοι δ' ἀκούουσιν ἱερὸν ἰχθὺν τὸν ἄνετον.

Arist. classifies erythrinos as one of the fish with which τὸ μὲν τίκτον ἐστὶ καὶ γεννῶν, τὸ δ' ὀχεῦον οὐκ ἔστιν, cf. also a more detailed discussion in *GA* 741a36–8. Demeter despised the hermaphroditism of this fish.[51] She disliked impure fish no less than other impure animals, cf. the treatment of the tope and the red mullet by her initiates in Ael. *NA* 9.65 οἱ μυούμενοι τοῖν θεοῖν οὐκ ἂν πάσαιντο γαλεοῦ φασιν· οὐ γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶναι καθαρὸν ὄψον, ἐπεὶ τῷ στόματι τίκτει. . . . . τῆς δὲ τρίγλης οὐκ ἂν γεύσαιντο οἱ αὐτοὶ μύσται etc.

Demeter's antipathy to erythrinos (here perhaps implied with ἔσχατος) found application in cult-practice. Σ R on Luc. *Dial. mer.* 7.4 (280.20 Rabe) says that erythrinos was among the fish debarred from the abundant table of the Haloa-festival in Eleusis: ἐνταῦθα οἶνός τε πολὺς πρόκειται καὶ τράπεζαι πάντων τῶν τῆς γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης γέμουσαι βρωμάτων πλὴν τῶν ἀπειρημένων ἐν τῷ μυστικῷ . . . καὶ θαλαττίων τρίγλης, ἐρυθίνου, μελανούρου, καράβου, γαλεοῦ, see Parker 1983, 358, 362–3. Demeter's aversion to erythrinos would justify a reference to it in *Demeter*, as is the case with wine in fr. 19 and probably with beans *ap.* Theoc. 7.66. Like these commodities, hyces would perhaps feature on the feasting table which the Coan royals prepared for Demeter. In contrast to wine, it is not known whether erythrinos played a part in Coan cult-practice. Fish was known as a sacrificial animal in Cos as an inscription laying down regulations in the posthumous shrine that Diomedon established for the cult of Heracles evidences, *HG* 10.42–3 = *IdC* ED 149.42–3 (*c.* 300 BC) ποιεῖν δὲ καὶ τὰν ἀποπυρίδα̣ | κ̣ατὰ τὰ πάτρια.[52] An Aristophanic fragment, *Thesm.* II fr. 333 ἰχθὺς ἐώνηταί τις, ἢ σηπίδιον/ἢ τῶν πλατειῶν καρίδων ἢ πουλύπους, suggests that fish was regularly consumed in the Attic Thesmophoria and according to Ael. *NA* 9.51 the participants in the Eleusinian mysteries held red mullet in honour.

The Cyrenean gloss ὕκης would appeal to P. for the common ἐρυθ(ρ)ῖνος. His attention to Cyrenean glosses is attested in *At. Gl.*

---

[51] Its impurity may be further suggested by its sexually invigorating properties. According to Xenocrates of Aphrodisias 16 (122.36 Ideler = Oribasius 1.129) erythrinos has aphrodisiac properties εἴ τις αὐτὸν ἐν οἴνῳ πνίξας πίοι, cf. also Pliny *NH* 32.50 and see Thompson 1947, 67. On erythrinos see Thompson 1967, 65f., M. Wellmann, *RE* VI.1.601, E. de Saint-Denis, *Vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique*, Paris 1947, 36–7, F. Capponi, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Halieuticon*, Leiden 1972, 447–50.

[52] On ἀποπυρίδα cf. Athen. 8.334e and on the inscription see L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae*, Leipzig 1906, 355, P-H 75, F. Dölger, *ΙΧΘΥΣ. Das Fischsymbol in frühchristlicher Zeit* ii, Münster 1932, 377–82, Sh-W, *ZPE* 24 (1977), 210–3, *id.* 364–5.

fr. 32 δῖνος. He might have discussed ὕκης in *Ataktoi*. It may be from the *At. Gl.* rather than from *Demeter* that Zenodotus picked it up to discuss it (apparently) in his *Ethnikai lexeis*, see K. Nickau, *RE Suppl.* XI.A.41.9f., 42.8f. Call., as a Cyrenean, had additional reasons to use this gloss in his poetry. His treatise Περὶ μετονομασίας ἰχθύων (fr. 406) dealt with dialect variations and a discussion on hyces could find a place there too.

18.a. ὕκης The beginnings of the poetic career of this fish-name are hazy. From Athenaeus' information that Hermippus in his treatise on Hipponax identified hyces with ioulis, it is commonly assumed that Hipponax first used the word (*IEG* 169). Hipponax mentioned species of fish in his poems and employed many glosses (cf. *IEG* 130f.; *IEG* 134 ἀλίβας is taken up by Call. fr. 216), but Hermippus' information may not directly refer to him (*Dubia* fr. 205 Degani). Subsequently, ὕκης occurs in a fragment of an unidentifiable author quoted by Athen. 7.304e (in the discussion of fish hippus) μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ καὶ †'Αντιφάνης ὁ Κολοφώνιος ἐν τῇ Θηβαΐδι† λέγων οὕτως· 'ἢ ὕκην ἢ ἵππον ἢ ὃν κίχλην καλέουσι'.[53] Then follows P.'s reference quoted in Athenaeus' hyces-entry, whence Call. *HE* 65 and probably fr. 509 ἐξ ἁλὸς οὐ †δίκην (: οὐδ' ὕκην Bentley) ἀνέρα Βουχέτιον/ ἕλκειν (see Schmitt 19 n. 2), Num. Her. *Halieutica SH* 571.1, 581.1 ὕκας ἀγεληίδας, Opp. *Hal.* 1.97.

18.b. ἰχθύς In disyllabic forms -υ- is usually long, as here, apart from rare exceptions, see Gow on Theoc. 21.49. In trisyllabic forms and compounds it is always short. — ὕκης and ἰχθύς are collective singulars, cf. Theoc. 21.6 ἰχθύος ἀγρευτῆρες . . δύο . . γέροντες with Gow ad loc., Leon. Tar. *HE* 66.2–3 κίχλης καὶ σκάρου ἰχθυβολεύς/καὶ λάβρου πέρκης, Erat. *CA* 12.1–2 ἰούλους/ἠὲ γενειῆτιν τρίγλην ἢ

---

[53] Jonse and Bentley emended 'Αντιφάνης to 'Αντίμαχος, whereas Stoll proposed 'Αντιφάνης ὁ κωμικός omitting ἐν τῇ Θηβαΐδι as a later addition. Wyss (Dub. fr. 157) wanted to ascribe the fragment to Antiphanes, Matthews (Dub. fr. 192) to Antimachus. Though seemingly an easier attribution, one would do well to resist Antimachean authorship. K-A (*PCG* ii, 421) discuss the reference but do not print it as a separate fragment of Antiphanes. In *PCG* ii, 313 they note that Antiphanes' name suffered a variety of disfigurements and it was confused with Antimachus' name (Eiecienda fr. 210) in Anecd. Oxon. III.203.39 Cramer (*PCG* 225). Wyss ingeniously emended Athenaeus' text into 'Αντιφάνης ὁ κωμικὸς ἐν Προβλήματι (*PCG* 192), "in huius enim fabulae griphis . . . heroico numero adstrictis complures pisces commemorantur", see Nesselrath 291–3. If the author of the verse is Antiphanes, a link between him and P. is possible.

περκάδα κίχλην, Nic. fr. 18.2 ἢ φάγροι ἢ σκῶπες ἀρείονες ἠὲ καὶ ὀρφός, Machon 28 ὄψου πετραίου παρατεθέντος ποικίλου, Leon. Alex. *FGE* 37.1 ἰχθῦν . . . οὐκ ἀγοράζει, Anon. *FGE* 21.4–5 πολὺν . . . βῶκα/ καὶ σκάρον οὐ θρίσσης νόσφιν ἀρυσσάμενοι, Antiphan. *PCG* 130, Marc. Sid. *GDRK* 63.17, *passim*, Opp. *Hal.* (e.g.) 2.187–8, and for the vernacular of the papyri (τὴν ἄγραν τοῦ ἐκβησομένου ἰχθύος, ἰχθύος ὑπηρεσία etc.) see A. Jördens, *ZPE* 84 (1990), 49 n. 17.

18.c. ἔσχατος Arist. *HA* 598a12–3 says that erythrinos is one of the deep-sea fish and this is echoed in P.'s ἔσχατος, cf. then Ov. *Hal.* 104 *caeruleaque rubens erythrinus in unda*, Opp. *Hal.* 1.95–6 (erythrinos etc.) χθαμαλοῖσι παρ' αἰγιαλοῖσι νέμονται,/ψάμμον ἐρεπτόμενοι. Hermippus implies that in P. the notion of depth is primary and this accounts for hyces being δυσθήρατος, cf. Theoc. 7.58 εὗρον, ὃς *ἔσχατα* φυκία κινεῖ (probably an echo of ὕκης . . ἔσχατος), 16.52, Phalaec. *HE* 4.4 Νότου πρήσαντος ἐσχάτην ἅλα 'the depths of the sea'. However, in view of Demeter's aversion to erythrinos a nuance of contempt may as well lurk. In general, fish were regarded as animals ἐκ τῶν μάλιστα ἀνοητοτάτων καὶ ἀμαθεστάτων (see Bodson 45–6) which dwell δίκην ἀμαθίας ἐσχάτης ἐσχάτας οἰκήσεις, Plato *Tim.* 92b (where ἐσχάτας = 'at the furthest point', i.e. far out into the sea as seen from the land, cf. *Od.* 6.204–5).

Fr. 19

This couplet seems to be a brief digression on Phlious, a small Doric town in the Argolid with which Cos bore ancient ties. It is quoted in Steph. Byz. in a lemma which strongly resembles Σ A.R. 1.115 (16.17 Wendel) πόλις Πελοποννήσου ἡ Ἀραιθυρέα, ἡ νῦν ὀνομαζομένη Φλιοῦς ἀπὸ Φλιοῦντος τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ Χθονοφύλης. . . . καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ Διόνυσος Φλιοῦς ὠνομάζετο ἀπὸ τοῦ φλεῖν (L: φλύειν P) τὸν οἶνον, ὅ ἐστιν εὐθηνεῖν. Steph. draws on it via Orus' *Ethnica* (see Wendel 1932, 93–4), who had himself used Sophocleius' commentary on the *Argonautica* (C. Wendel, *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*, Berlin 1935, xxi, Vian i, xlii), who would in his turn derive the Philitan quotation from Theon's Σ on the Apollonian line. This is all the more probable since, in addition to the verbal similarities, these two are the only ancient sources deriving Φλιοῦς from φλέω 'abound', a connection that may be relevant to the Philitan context (see n. 1d). Orus reproduces Theon's notes on A.R. (frr. 12, 13) in other instances too, such as Steph. Byz. 77.16 Ἅλος or *id.* 120.9 Ἀρκαδία.

Phlious was identified with Homeric Araithyrea (*Il.* 2.571, A.R. 1.115), the ruins of which were still there in late Hellenistic times, cf. Strabo 8.6.24, Paus. 2.12.5 and see Erbse (I.306) on Σ *Il.* 2.571. Phlious had a widespread cult of Demeter, cf. Paus. 2.13.5 and see Roscher ii, 1294. Above all possible connections to Cos, Phlious was reputed for its excellent wine. Dionysus' cult must have been important (see Meyer 288, G. Casadio, *Storia del culto di Dioniso in Argolide*, Rome 1994) and a local tradition held that the town was built by one of his sons. The fertility of the Phliasian plain makes Araithyrea ἐρατεινή in *Il.* 2.571 and its wine renders Argonaut Phlious ἀφνειὸς . . . Διωνύσοιο ἕκητι/πατρὸς ἑοῦ in A.R. 1.116–7. The fame of Phliasian wine exceeded the boundaries of the Argolid, cf. Antiphan. *PCG* 232.2 (Athen. 1.27d) and even nowadays a vast vineyard stretches away around the modern village of Phleiasia, see R. Baladie, *Le Peloponnèse de Strabon*, Paris 1980, 181 n. 51. The importance of viticulture for Phlius is not least indicated by the golden-plated and honours-receiving she-goat established in the central market with the aim of placating the constellation 'Goat' which τὰς ἀμπέλους λυμαίνεται συνεχῶς, Paus. 2.13.6.

Coan wine was just as famous. Cos, as most islands in the eastern Aegean (but not Samos), produced wine of high quality and reputation. Strabo 14.1.15 and 14.2.19 εὔκαρπος δὲ πᾶσα οἴνῳ δὲ καὶ ἀρίστη, καθάπερ Χῖος καὶ Λέσβος twice put it side by side with the excellent wine of Chios and Lesbos. Literary and archaeological evidence suggests that the Coan wine-trade flourished from the 4th cent. BC onwards. From *LSCG* 168.9 (Cos, 1st/2nd cent. BC) we learn that the owners of τοὶ ἀμπελοστατοῦντες 'skilled workmen of viticulture' were liable to taxation, as was very probably the wine production itself. Coan wine was also prescribed for various medicinal purposes. It still enjoyed a good name in Byzantine times, as it does nowadays.[54]

It seems that the opportunity for a Phlious-reference in *Demeter* is owed to wine. It is emphatically stated that Phlious was built by a son of Dionysus. A similar statement in A.R. links the prosperity of

[54] On Coan wine cf. also Athen. 1.32a, 1.33b, Demosth. *In Lacr.* 35 (import in Athens), Hippocr. *Aff.* 25 and see Sh-W 236–41, Craik 16–7, Höghammar 35–6. On its medicinal use see P-H xliii–xliv, Sh-W 236 n. 1 and in general J. Jouanna, "Le vin et la médecine dans la Grèce ancienne", *REG* 109 (1996), 410–34. For the reputation of Coan wine in Byzantine times see Koukoules v, 125.

the town with its production of wine. This assumption gains further support by *HHD* 206–10:

> τῇ δὲ δέπας Μετάνειρα δίδου μελιηδέος οἴνου
> πλήσασ', ἡ δ' ἀνένευσ'· οὐ γὰρ θεμιτόν οἱ ἔφασκε
> πίνειν οἶνον ἐρυθρόν, ἄνωγε δ' ἄρ' ἄλφι καὶ ὕδωρ
> δοῦναι μίξασαν πιέμεν γληχῶνι τερεινῇ.
> ἡ δὲ κυκεῶ τεύξασα θεᾷ πόρεν ὡς ἐκέλευσε.

Demeter, in principle, refuses to drink anything (cf. *HHD* 49–50, 200, Call. *HyDem.* 8, Ov. *Met.* 5.446–7, Nonn. *D.* 6.30–1), but she denounces wine-drinking in particular, cf. also Diosc. *HE* 19.9 (Anacr.) καὶ ἐν Δηοῦς ['Underworld'] οἰνωμένος. Demeter's stand was observed in ritual. Normally, sacrifices to Demeter, as to other chthonic deities, were wineless (νηφάλια), see Wächter 109, A-H-S, Richardson on *HHD* 207. Cos is an exception here. As *HG* 1A.60–1 = *LSCG* 151A.60–1 (4th cent. BC) κύλικες κ̣[αι]|[ν]α̣ὶ δύο δίδονται· θύει̣ ἱ̣ερ̣ε̣ὺς [καὶ ἱερ]ὰ̣ παρέχει evidences, wine was a regular offering to Demeter in local cult. In Phigalia ἀμπέλου καρπός was offered to Demeter too, Paus. 8.42.11, see Farnell iii, 102, 302 n. 107 for other exceptions and Mynors on Virg. *G.* 1.344 (farmer to Ceres) *cui tu lacte favos et miti dilue Baccho.*

P., who referred to other Coan commodities insisting on those to which Demeter was traditionally averse, might have pointed out the heretical offering of wine to Demeter in Cos. Significantly, in the elegant Theoc. 7.147 Phrasidamus and Antigenes, two Coan nobles, celebrate their private festival of Demeter by drinking a four-year old wine and ἄμπελοι feature in Philetas' garden in Long. 2.3.4. The circumstances in *Demeter* would presumably be similar to the ones in the Homeric hymn. The opportunity for a digression on Phlious would be given during the banquet in Chalcon's palace. Demeter's host Astraeus, during a banquet held in her honour in Nonn. *D.* 6.33–4, is successful in convincing Demeter to drink nectar. The goddess, as in local cult, would have to — at least — bear with the irregularity.

Besides, the very name of Phlious implies (a prohibited) abundance of commodities, cf. Hsch. φ 619 φλιοῦς· ἡ τῶν καρπῶν ἔκχυσις, and prompts a connection with φλεῖν 'abound', attested in extant literature only in Aesch. *Ag.* 377, 1416, both times in genitive absolute, a usage that makes it look like a fossilised form, cf. Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 683e τὸ γὰρ ἄγαν ἀκμάζειν καὶ τεθηλέναι φλοίειν ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν

λέγεσθαι citing Antim. fr. 37. Crucially, the only ancient sources directly linking the town's name with φλεῖν are Σ A.R. 1.115 via Διόνυσος Φλιοῦς whence Steph. Byz. s.v. Φλιοῦς, both of them related to the Philitan fragment. One would think that the derivation of Φλιοῦς from φλεῖν was suggested by the Philitan context (cf. n. 1d). The effect of affluence is intensified by a studied flow of φ-λ-ι-ς sounds: *Φλιοῦς.. πόλις... φίλος.. / Φλιοῦς... λευκολόφος*.[55] Therefore, his lines may have been treated by his compatriot, late Hellenistic historian, Socrates (see fr. 5a.b) in Ἐπικλήσεις θεῶν fr. 4 Tresp, *q.v.* discussing Dionysus Φλεύς as being derived παρὰ τὸ εὐκαρπεῖν (EtM 796.43 s.v. φλῶ).

The fragment was earlier ascribed to *Demeter* on false premises. "Cum Dysaules, Celei frater, Phliasiam Cereris religionem condidisse crederetur, fieri potuit, ut de rebus Phliasiis Philetas in Cerere nonnulla exponeret", Maass 1895a, ix n. 5 *cl.* Paus. 2.14.2. Nevertheless, Paus. refers not to Phlious but to Celeai, a locality five stades away. So, Nowacki 72 demolished his argument. Cessi 1908, 132–3 thought that Demeter went around the Peloponnese and P. touches on the archaeology of different places. H. Stadtmüller, *BPhW* 15 (1897), 453 advanced the theory that this couplet is part of a passage dealing with the origins of the Nemean Games and the death of Archemorus *cl.* Prop. 2.34.37–8. *Campbell associated this fragment with *Telephus*. In A.R. 4.566–71 Poseidon snatches away Cercyra, a daughter of Asopus, ἑκὰς Φλειουντίδος αἴης. Apollonius displaces young Cercyra from Alcinous' island to Κέρκυραν ... Μελαίναν, an island south of Dubrovnik. Since Phlious' homeland is linked to 'Corcyra', scene of the Jason/Medea marriage in *Telephus*? fr. 22, Phlious could be mentioned in this connection. However, the Apollonian text does not

[55] The alliteration can also imply an overflow of words, cf. Hsch. φ 611 φλυάσσει· φλυαρεῖ, ληρεῖ, *LSJ* s.vv. φλέδων, φλύω, Magnelli 215–6. A.R. 2.393–4 φέρβονται Φίλυρες· Φιλύρων δ' ἐφύρπεθεν ἔασι/Μάκρωνες occurs in a lengthy speech by Phineus after dining with the Argonauts. Φίλυρες might have prompted a reminiscence of Φλιοῦς. The alliteration would stress Phineus' bubbling and would make a point since the ἀφραδίη for which he was punished by the gods was his detailed prophecies, cf. 2.246, 311–6. For similarly-sounding alliterations (here unclassified) cf. *Il.* 1.236–7 (wooden stick) χαλκὸς ἔλεψε/φύλλά τε καὶ φλοιόν, 13.798–9 κύματα παφλάζοντα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης,/κυρτὰ φαληριόωντα, A.R. 1.1051–52 ἐς δὲ πύλας.. πέσον.. αἶψα δ' αὐτῆς/πλῆτο πόλις.. ὑποτροπίῃ πολέμοιο, Arat. 332–3 (when Sirius rises) οὐκέτι.../φυταλιαὶ ψεύδονται ἀναλδέα φυλλιόωσαι/.../... τῶν δὲ φλόον ὤλεσε πάντα. In Simias *CA* 7 αἰθέρος ὠκεῖαι πρόπολοι πίλναντο Πέλειαι the sonority aims at portraying the flapping of the birds.

offer any touch of polemic. ἑκὰς Φλειουντίδος αἴης is true for both Cercyrai and 'far away from home' belongs to the conventions of elopement. In P. emphatic 'Dionysus' own son . . . who himself etc.' points to wine-growing Phlious, as in A.R. 1.115–7. Moreover, we do not know what P. called Alcinous' island. Phliasian Cercyra is unlikely to have been mentioned in relation to a name other than anachronistic *Cercyra*, used by Call. fr. 12.4 (Pfeiffer ad loc.), cf. *HyDel.* 156, but *Drepane* in fr. 14 as always in A.R.

By influence of Peripatus, P., as other erudite poets, exhibits an interest in foundation legends. It is from this point of view that these lines are echoed in Call. *HyAp.* 56–7 in a passage dealing with Apollo *ktistes*. The mutual association of this fragment with Demeter and Cos, along with Call.'s echo, would point to *Demeter*.

19.1a. Φλιοῦς γὰρ πόλις ἐστί This should not be mistaken for the common introduction of a locality of the type *Il.* 6.152 ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη etc. or for a transition such as Hecat. *FGrH* 1 F 129 Χαλκὶς πόλις ἐστίν etc., Dion. Callix. 99 εἶτ' Ὠκαλέα πόλις ἐστὶ etc. (iambics). The formulation of the fragment implies that the very existence of small and neglected Phlious is set in doubt and this is an emphatic statement confirming Phlious' role. It is similar to expressions used when a beneficiary deity is being neglected, as *Il.* 9.502 καὶ γάρ τε Λιταί εἰσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο/. . ./αἵ etc., Alcm. *PMGF* 1.36 ἔστι τις σιῶν τίσις, Soph. *OC* 1267–68 ἀλλ' ἔστι γὰρ καὶ Ζηνὶ σύνθακος θρόνων/Αἰδώς, Eur. *Med.* 1085–86 ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἔστιν μοῦσα καὶ ἡμῖν,/ἣ etc., Antim. fr. 131.1 ἔστι δέ τις Νέμεσις μεγάλη θεός, ἣ etc. with Matthews ad loc., West on Hes. *WD* 11–46, sometimes reinforced through repetition, as Lyc. 535–7 ἀλλ' ἔστι γάρ τις, ἔστι καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδα/ἡμῖν ἀρωγὸς πρευμενὴς ὁ Δρύμνιος/δαίμων . . . /ὅς etc., Cercidas? *CA* 18.34 ἔστιν γάρ, ἔστιν ὃς τάδε σκοπεῖ δαίμων, Soph. *Phil.* 1241, Adesp. *TrGF* 492 ἔσθ', ὡς ἔοικεν, ἔστιν οὐχ ὁρώμενον/ . . . οὐδὲ προσδοκώμενον/δαιμόνιον, *GVI* 675a.9 (3rd cent. AD) ἔστι γὰ<ρ> ἐν φθιμένοις Νέμεσις μέγα, ἔστι ἐπὶ τύνβοις, cf. *GVI* 657.6 (*c.* 205 AD) ζώει τοὶ νεκύων, ζώει τειμήορος Ἄτη. For lively ἔστι confirming what may be regarded as doubtful cf. Call. *HE* 9.1–2 ἔστι τι, ναὶ τὸν Πᾶνα, κεκρυμμένον, ἔστι τι . ./ναὶ μὰ τὸν Διώνυσον, πῦρ, Theoc. 3.20 ἔστι καὶ ἐν κενεοῖσι φιλήμασιν ἁδέα τέρψις, 24.40, Leon. Tar. *HE* 19.11–2 εἰσὶ θανόντων,/εἰσὶν ἀμοιβαῖαι κἂν φθιμένοις χάριτες, Meleag. *HE* 26.4, 90.4, in oratory see Wankel on Dem. *De cor.* 308 ἔστιν γάρ, ἔστιν ἡσυχία . . . συμφέρουσα τῇ πόλει.

19.1b. Φλιοῦς Inscriptions until Imperial times unanimously offer Φλειοῦς. The MSS of the literary texts divide among themselves, see Meyer 269–71, *id.*, *RE Suppl.* IX.827, Threatte i, 322–3.

19.1c. Φλιοῦς . . ./Φλιοῦς For the anaphora in general see fr. 21.1a. This is a false one, since the name of the city in 1 (Φλιοῦς . . . πόλις) coincides with the name of its founder in 2. The repetition draws attention to Phlious which does not correspond to the actual importance of this town. This exploits an older technique. Arist. *Rhet.* 1414a6 and Demetr. *De eloc.* 61 note the emphatic effect produced by the triple repetition of the name of marginal Nireus in *Il.* 2.671–3. On a formal level, the second Φλιοῦς followed by a relative clause creates a typical anaphora scheme used to provide supplementary information, cf. *Il.* 12.95–6, *Od.* 1.22–3 and see Fehling 1969, 184–5.

19.1d. γάρ introduces an explanatory parenthesis which is a frequent stylistic device in Hellenistic poetry. These have been studied by M. von Albrecht, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion*, Hildesheim 1964, see also Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 22, 70, R. J. Tarrant, "Parenthetically Speaking (in Virgil and other Poets)" in P. Knox – C. Foss (edd.), *Style and Tradition. Studies in honor of Wendel Clausen*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1998, 141f. It is probable that Phlious or a cognate was mentioned in the preceding line: the source of the fragment might suggest φλεῖν.

19.1e. Διωνύσου φίλος υἱός/Φλιοῦς has an emphatic effect ('Dionysus' own son'), see next n. φίλος υἱός in nominative or accusative is 16x clausular in Homer as well as in a Zenodotean verse replacing *Il.* 16.666. Such constructions are common, cf. *Il.* 2.564 Σθένελος, Καπανῆος . . φίλος υἱός/, 11.575–6 Εὐαίμονος ἀγλαὸς υἱός/Εὐρύπυλος, Hes. *Theog.* 526–7 Ἀλκμήνης . . ἄλκιμος υἱός/Ἡρακλέης, *id.* fr. 257.1 Μόλουρον Ἀρίσβαντος φίλον υἱόν/, an early 5th cent. BC epitaph from Megara *apud* J. Ebert, *ZPE* 112 (1996), 66 v. 1 Πόλλις Ἀσōπίχō φίλος hυιός/, epigr. sep. 114.1 Cougny Αἰνείαν Κύπριδός τε καὶ Ἀγχίσου φίλον υἱόν/, next *Il.* 13.701 Αἴας . . . Ὀιλῆος ταχὺς υἱός/, A.R. 2.118 Ἀγκαῖος Λυκοόργοιο θρασὺς υἱός/, later Colluth. 283–4 /εἰμὶ . . Πριάμοιο . . φίλος υἱός/εἰμὶ δέ etc.

19.2a. Φλιοῦς Φλ(ε)ίας or Φλιοῦς is a son of Dionysus in all but the Argive version, which is mentioned only to be discredited by Paus. 2.12.6. Cf. A.R. 1.115 with Σ, Paus. 2.6.6, 2.12.6, Hyg. *Fab.*

14, Orph. *Arg.* 194–6, Val. Flacc. 1.411, Steph. Byz. *l.c.* He is mostly known as an Argonaut, see M. L. Towbridge, *RE* XX.1.290–1, Vian on A.R. 1.117.

19.2b. ἣν αὐτὸς| δείματο λευκολόφος Cf. *Od.* 14.7–8 (αὐλή) ἥν ῥα συβώτης/αὐτὸς δείμαθ', Christod. *AP* 7.697.6 Λυχνιδόν, ἣν Φοῖνιξ Κάδμος ἔδειμε πόλιν (with F. Tissoni, *Acme* 53 (2000), 218), Nonn. *D.* 41.66–7 Βερόης . . πόλιν . . ./ἣν Κρόνος αὐτὸς ἔδειμε. The phrase is perhaps echoed in A.R. 1.142–3 ἀλλά μιν αὐτός/γείνατο . . ./Λητοΐδης of another disputed and divine father, Apollo as parent of Idmon, cf. also *HH* 28.4 Τριτογενῆ, τὴν αὐτὸς ἐγείνατο μητίετα Ζεύς. — P.'s emphatic expression ranks him on the side of what is apparently a local version, that Phlious built his city. Paus. 2.12.3 notes that Phliasian archaeology was a controversial subject: διάφορα δὲ ἐς τοὺς Φλιασίους τὰ πολλὰ εἰδὼς εἰρημένα, τοῖς μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὡμολογημένοις χρήσομαι. According to his account, autochthonous Aras founded Arantia around hillock Arantinos. When his daughter Araithyrea died prematurely the town took her name. Then Phlias, a son of Dionysus, gave it its final name, Paus. 2.12.3–6, cf. Σ D *Il.* 2.571 (Araithyrea) ὕστερον Φλιοῦς προσηγορεύθη ἀπὸ Φλιοῦντος τοῦ Διονύσου. Strabo 8.6.24 reports that it was Araithyrea's citizens who ἀναστάντες (this might suggest expulsion by force, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 12.4) ἐκεῖθεν πρὸ τριάκοντα σταδίων ἔκτισαν πόλιν, ἣν ἐκάλεσαν Φλιοῦντα.

19.2c. λευκολόφος 'white-crested'. Non-Homeric, first in Anacr. *PMG* 433.1–2 ἐγὼ δ' ἔχων σκύπφον Ἐρξίωνι/τῷ λευκολόφῳ μεστὸν ἐξέπινον. -λόφος adjj. belong to elevated vocabulary: in Ar. *Ran.* 1016 λευκολόφους τρυφαλείας is used by Aeschylus boasting of his pure and elevated diction, cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 119 λευκολόφας, Crinag. *GPh* 44.2 ποιηρὸν τοῦτ' ἀνὰ λευκόλοφον (it "presumably means a hill with grassy slopes and a crest of white rock", G-P ad loc.). Antim. fr. 95 has πυρσολόφους "straps cut from fire-dried leather", Theoc. 22.72 φοινικολόφος of a bird (first in Eur. *Phoen.* 820 of a dragon). — The adj. is chosen to fit both town and founder, as Phlious is built on a fertile upland surrounded by hillocks. Here it rather applies to the founder whose name lies closer and is supported by an internal rhyme αὐτὸς . . . λευκολόφος. λευκός often applies to women's flesh and is regularly used by Aristophanes of homosexuals.[56] The adj.

[56] See Ussher on *Eccl.* 63–4, J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse*, Oxford ²1991, 211. For effeminating white complexion cf. Cycnus, described by Theoc. 16.49 as

may refer to Phlious' womanish features, as inherited by him from his effeminate father. This may be an established feature of his personality, cf. Val. Flacc. 1.411–2 *et quem fama genus non est decepta Lyaei/ Phlias immissus patrios de vertice crines*, 3.148–9 *gravis . . ./Phlias* in a battle scene, Orph. *Arg.* 196 (Phlias) ἄμωμον ἔχοντα δέμας καὶ ἐπίφρονα μῆτιν. Dionysus' long hair and white complexion were features of his effeminacy, cf. Eur. *Bac.* 453–9 with Dodds ad loc., Nonn. *D.* 17.185.

Fr. 20

Antigonus quotes this couplet for its paradoxic content, but offers no indication as to the work it is derived from. Reitzenstein 1893, 179 ascribed it to *Paegnia* ("non iniuria" Powell) because of its content, Kuchenmüller 64 n. 2 because of its form. *A. S. Hollis also felt that this fragment "might well belong to a riddling epigram" as fr. 25. Cessi 1908, 128 n. 4 maintained that it is part of *Demeter* describing the goddess' wanderings in Sicily, where cactus grows. Antigonus quotes another fragment of P. with paradoxical content (fr. 14) which probably belongs to *Demeter*. Other considerations would point to this attribution too. The urge for the *aulos* to play is typical in banquets, where music commonly entertains the participants (cf. Athen. 14.616e–618c and see West 1992, 24–8), and we may be dealing with one here. This would be part of Chalcon's hospitality-offering to Demeter.

Chalcon might have noticed the sad disposition of Demeter and an effort to change that is a typical feature of the Demeter-myth (Foley 45–6). In *HHD* 198–205 Demeter changed her mood due to the obscene jokes of Iambe. Iambe also plays such a role in Philic. *SH* 680.54f., Nic. *Ther.* 132, cf. [Apollod.] 1.5.1, and in the Orphic version a similar character is called Baubo (*OrphF* 52, see Burkert 1983, 285 n. 52, M. Olender, *RHR* 202 (1985), 3–55), cf. also Call. fr. 474 †περσίητ' ἕνεκεν πένθος ἀπωμόσατ[ο which may well refer to

---

θῆλυν ἀπὸ χροιᾶς where the Σ (328.9 Wendel) relate Hellanic. *FGrH* 4 F 148 and Hes. fr. 237 Ἡσίοδος δὲ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔχειν αὐτόν φησι λευκήν. Similarly, Achilleus in Bion fr. 2.16f., transvested to avoid recruitment for Troy, is weaving χερὶ λευκᾷ and blushing χιονέαις . . παρηίσι and in Nonn. *D.* 11.223 Asterios, an eromenos of Dionysus, appears with λευκὸν . . δέμας. In Anacreon *l.c.* λευκολόφος Erxion may be an effeminate beloved of the poet, notorious for his inclination to puerile loves. Lovers commonly toasted each other with strong wine, cf. e.g. Theoc. 2.151–2 with Gow ad loc.

Demeter. Nevertheless, there seems to have existed a tradition according to which Demeter's mood ameliorated by the sound of pipes and probably by dancing. Such is the effect of the *aulos* in Eur. *Hel.* 1339–52 (see M. C. Giammarco-Razzano, "Demeter *auletris*", *PP* 50 (1995), 116–35):

Ζεὺς μειλίσσων στυγίους
Ματρὸς ὀργὰς ἐνέπει·
Βᾶτε, σεμναὶ Χάριτες,
ἴτε, τὰν περὶ παρθένῳ
Δηῷ θυμωσαμέναν
†λύπαν ἐξαλλάξατ'† ἀλαλᾷ
Μοῦσαί θ' ὕμνοισι χορῶν.
χαλκοῦ δ' αὐδὰν χθονίαν
τύπανά τ' ἔλαβε βυρσοτενῆ
καλλίστα τότε πρῶτα μακά-
ρων Κύπρις· γέλασεν δὲ θεά
δέξατό τ' ἐς χέρας
βαρύβρομον αὐλόν
τερφθεῖσ' ἀλαλαγμῷ.

It is from this same vein that Nonn. *D.* 6.24f. draws, in a remarkable parallel to this postulated Philitan scene. In Nonnus, agitated Demeter decides to consult the astronomer Astraeus who welcomes her (see P. Chuvin, *Nonnos* iii, Budé 1992, 5–6), and being ἡδυεπής persuades her to drink nectar. Astraeus also organises a dinner ὄφρα μερίμνας/θυμοδακεῖς Δήμητρος ἀποσκεδάσειε τραπέζῃ (35–6). A party follows in which Zephyrus, a son of Astraeus, entertains the sorrowful goddess by playing pipes, 42–3 Ζέφυρος δὲ περιθλίβων θρόον αὐλοῦ/εἰαρινοῖς δονάκεσσι μελίζετο θῆλυς ἀήτης. Hesperus, another son of Astraeus, takes part by dancing while holding a torch, 46–9 (for Hesperus and Demeter's torches cf. Ov. *Met.* 441–3). Interestingly, Zephyrus as a wind and Hesperus as a star may have featured in *Demeter*, see p. 286f. on Call. *HyAp.* 81f., p. 293f. on *id.* *HyDem.* 7. Dancing may be another feature of this tradition meaning to lay down the prototype for the nocturnal torch-dances in honour of Demeter.[57] Note that in Call. *HyAp.* 8 the youngsters prepare for

[57] Cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 280f., 1151–52, *Ran.* 440f., Eur. *Ion* 1074, see Deubner 53, Richardson 1974, 214–5 (dancing and jesting), S. H. Londsale, *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion*, Baltimore-London 1993, 158–60.

μολπήν and χορόν. All this, by tradition, works out effectively, Nonn. *D.* 6.51 (Demeter) σεισαμένη βαρὺ κέντρον ἀμερσινόοιο μερίμνης.

This scene seems to be alluded to in Theoc. 7.71–2 αὐλησεῦντι δέ μοι δύο ποιμένες . . ./. . . ὁ δὲ Τίτυρος ἐγγύθεν ᾀσεῖ etc. and may then be nicely echoed in Long. 2.35–6, where oxherd Philetas, by request of Daphnis and Chloe, plays his syrinx in a banquet (which he does at the happy-end feast in 4.38.3 too), and that is followed by Dryas' mimetic dance, διεγερθεὶς οὖν ὁ Φιλητᾶς καὶ καθίσας ἐν καθέδρᾳ ὄρθιον . . . ἐνέπνει . . . . αὐλῶν τις ἂν ᾠήθη συναυλούντων ἀκούειν· τοσοῦτον ἤχει τὸ σύριγμα. [. . .] (36) οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι σιωπῇ κατέκειντο τερπόμενοι. Δρύας δὲ ἀναστὰς καὶ κελεύσας συρίζειν Διονυσιακὸν μέλος, ἐπιλήνιον αὐτοῖς ὄρχησιν ὠρχήσατο· καὶ ἐῴκει ποτὲ μὲν τρυγῶντι, ποτὲ δὲ φέροντι ἀρρίχους, εἶτα πατοῦντι τοὺς βότρυς, εἶτα πληροῦντι τοὺς πίθους, εἶτα πίνοντι τοῦ γλεύκους, whence in Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13.11 at a banquet with generous consumption of wine παρῆν Κρουμάτιον ἡ Μεγάρας καταυλοῦσα. The images described here rely on Theoc., but for φέροντι ἀρρίχους cf. fr. 17 and for filling the wine-jars and drinking wine see fr. 19 and, perhaps, Theoc. 7.154–5, Hsch. ν 354 νεοστεφέος· νεοκράτου, discussed in Appendix I.

Even the paradoxical belief is tailored to fit Demeter. Shedding of blood is the classic way of miasma, but the fawn needs to be unpricked by any thorn if its tibia are to become a tuneful musical instrument. Its purity is thus guaranteed. In *HG* 8.a.ii, a Coan inscription of the 3rd cent. BC prescribing strict rules of purity, priestesses of Demeter are not allowed to wear clothing fabricated from dead animals or eat the meat of animals slaughtered in an inappropriate fashion, see Parker 1983, 52, cf. *IdC* ED 178a(A).6–7 (2nd cent. BC) for purity-regulations concerning the priestess of Aphrodite Pandamos, with M. P. J. Dillon, *ZPE* 124 (1999), 65 for other inscriptional evidence from Cos prescribing purificatory prerequisites. The source of the paradox is not known. P.'s interest in paradoxes is influenced by the Peripatus and cactus, a plant occurring in a non-Greek land, is first mentioned in Phaenias and Theophrastus (see n. 2b), both pupils of Aristotle. The Stagirite was the first to exhibit interest in paradoxography focusing on animals and plants. P. provides the first attestation of this cactus-miracle, but he might rely on Aristotle, cf. the latter's interest in another prickly plant producing part of a musical instrument in Antig. Car. *Mir.* 169 περὶ δὲ τῶν φυτῶν τῆς ἀκάνθης εἶδος Ἀριστοτέλην φάσκειν περὶ τὴν Ἐρύθειαν εὑρίσκεσθαι διαποίκιλον τὴν χρόαν, ἐξ οὗ πλῆκτρα γίνεσθαι etc.

P.'s unusual, cryptic way of describing the mirable might allude to the banqueters' habit of exchanging riddles among themselves, cf. Athen. 10.457c-f. Metrical enigmas in feasts attracted some attention in the circle of Aristotle (*Poet.* 1458a26, *Rhet.* 1405b1) and his pupil Clearchus wrote Περὶ γρίφων, of which plenty of information survives in Athenaeus (frr. 84–95). Athenaeus quotes a riddle of similar content ascribing it to Theogn. 1229–30 ἤδη γάρ με κέκληκε θαλάσσιος οἴκαδε νεκρός,/τεθνηκὼς ζωῷ φθεγγόμενος στόματι, i.e. the cockle-shell used as a musical instrument.

Antigonus draws directly on P. If he had used an intermediate source, following his practice in the first part of his work (ch.s 1–26), he would have named his immediate source ad hoc. Wil. 1881, 22 noted on the chapters drawing on poets that "diese Kapitel haben zumeist gar keinen weiteren Zweck als die Dichter zu illustrieren, sie haben auch keine Quelle, sind aber eben deshalb von den Lexikographen, die von der Dichterexegese ausgehen, besonders berücksichtigt". Hsch. κ 363 κάκτος· ἄκανθα, ὑφ' ἧς ἐὰν πληγῇ νεβρός, ἀχρεῖα ἴσχει τὰ ὀστᾶ εἰς αὐλούς depends on Antigonus (note the verbal similarities). So does Athenaeus, who quotes P. in his discussion on cactus. Wil. 1881, 21 n. 12 rightfully assumed that Antigonus' interpretation also stood in the text of Athenaeus, which was then omitted by the epitomiser. Σ Theoc. 4.57b (151.6 Wendel) ἀσπάλαθοι: εἶδος ἀκάνθης, ᾗ πληγέντες οἱ ἔλαφοι ἀποθνήσκουσιν seems to refer to κάκτοι, occurring as a *v.l.* of ῥάμνοι in that verse, rather than to ἀσπάλαθοι (see M. Maehler on POxy. 4432.9), and in its original form its relevance to P. would probably be explicit.

In a parenthetical digression, probably with P. in mind, Call. *HyArt.* 244–5 ascribed to Athena the invention of the bone-pipes: οὐ γάρ πω νέβρεια δι' ὀστέα τετρήναντο,/ἔργον Ἀθηναίης ἐλάφῳ κακόν.[58] Bone-pipes were considered to be old-fashioned and to produce a sound of poor quality, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 862–3, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 75.1 νεβρείων ὁπόσον σάλπιγξ ὑπερίαχε αὐλῶν and Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 150e, in a jesting mood, says that the pipe-makers of his time προέμενοι τὰ νεβρεῖα χρῶνται τοῖς ὀνείοις καὶ βέλτιον ἠχεῖν λέγουσιν. P. seems to be referring to them as an archaistic element appropriate to the

[58] See Bornmann ad loc. Here Call. may conflate material from P. and a Boeotian tradition. Bone-pipes are often associated with Thebes, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 862–3, Juba *FGrH* 275 F 82 (Athen. 4.82e), Pollux 4.75, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 75.1 νεβρείων ... αὐλῶν in an epigram dedicated to Pindar.

times when Demeter visited Cos. Long. 2.35.2 says of Philetas' syrinx that εἴκασεν ἄν τις εἶναι ταύτην ἐκείνην, ἣν ὁ Πὰν πρώτην ἐπήξατο.

20.1a. γηρύσαιτο δέ violates Hilberg's law (words of the shape x – ⏑⏑ do not end in the second foot) and for Call. it would be an unacceptable opening rhythm, see p. 79. γηρύω is, strictly speaking, non-Homeric, though cf. hapaxes *Il.* 4.437 γῆρυς, *Od.* 12.187 μελίγηρυν. Aesch. *Eum.* 569 describes the sound produced by a trumpet as ὑπέρτονον γήρυμα. The verb can apply to the voice of animals, melodic as in Theoc. 1.136 (owls and nightingales), Pamphil. *HE* 1.3 (cicada), poeticising Plut. *De soll. anim.* 973a (birds), or not so melodic as Theoc. 9.7 (calf and cow, panpipe and oxherd), Meleag. *HE* 118.6 (cock) and cf. γῆρυς in Eur. *Tro.* 441 (oxen), A.R. 1.1244 (sheep), Simias *HE* 1.2 (partridge), Antip. Thess. *GPh* 82.2 (cock). P. applies it to a musical instrument made of an animal's bone. The effect is somehow paradoxical, as the fawn articulating a feeble, ugly sound, is now said to produce a post-mortal melody, cf. Plut. *Sept. sap. conv.* 150e (donkey-tibia) ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ὄνον εἰ παχύτατος καὶ ἀμουσότατος ὢν τἄλλα λεπτότατον καὶ μουσικώτατον ὀστέον παρέχεται. — The following δέ is the one used in "passionate or lively exclamations", Denniston 172.

20.1b. νεβρός is a παρὰ προσδοκίαν for αὐλός, modelled on the ancient metonymy of χέλυς for λύρα. Its corruption into νεκρός is common, cf. Cleoboulina *IEG* 3, Anacr. *PMG* 408.1, Bacch. 13.87, Aesch. *Eum.* 111, 246, Eur. fr. 677, Timo Phlias. *SH* 790. In Homer the word occurs 10x, mostly masculine, as is usual later. Feminine in *Il.* 4.243, Bacch. 13.87, Eur. *Alc.* 585, *Bac.* 866, *El.* 860, Adesp. *TrGF* 419, always in Theoc. (5x) where the gender is discernible (see Gow on 11.40), Simias *Ov.* 13. Not in A.R., hapax in Call. *HyArt.* 95, where the gender is not identifiable.

20.1c. ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ὀλέσασα ψυχήν varies Homeric θυμόν, *Il.* 8.90, *al.* ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὄλεσσεν/, 16.861 ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι/ ~ *Od.* 12.350, *al.*, next *Il.* 13.763 = 24.168 ψυχὰς ὀλέσαντες, 22.467 ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσε/, Emped. 31 B 138 D-K (slaughter of an animal) χαλκῷ ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ἀρύσας, Pers. *HE* 7.2–3 ἀπὸ ψυχὰν ἐρύσαντο/ὠδῖνες, Nic. *Ther.* 705 (sea-turtle) κεφαλῆς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἀράξαι/.[59] Ascription of

[59] ψυχή and θυμός can both be employed for the loss of life. H. Erbse, *Glotta* 71 (1993), 131 defined their semantic difference: "Mit dem Entweichen des θυμός

θυμός to animals is regular in Homer, but P. employs the choicer ψυχή, *Od.* 14.426 (σῦς), [Hes.] *Scut.* 173 (κάπρος), Emped. *l.c.* ζωὴν, offered by the Antigonus' cod., is a gloss that crept into the text. It derives little support from usages such as A.R. 4.1305 ἀπὸ ζωῆς ἐλίασθεν/, further *id.* 4.1433–34 ἀπούρας/φρουρὸν ὄφιν ζωῆς, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 102.6 ἀπὸ ζωὴν εἵλετο.

20.2a. νεβρὸς . . ./ὀξείης κάκτου τύμμα is echoed in Theoc. 10.4 ὥσπερ ὄις ποίμνας, ἆς τὸν πόδα κάκτος ἔτυψε said by Milon who later sings a hymn to Demeter,[60] cf. also Eryc. *GPh* 9.2 ἀραχναίη σκαιὸν ἔτυψε πόδα. Nic. *Alex.* 126 οἷά τε *γήρεια νέον τεθρυμμένα κάκτου* echoes the four most memorable words of this fragment. A variant supplied by the Σ Theoc. 4.57a ἐν γὰρ ὄρει ῥάμνοι (codd.: κάκτοι Σ) τε καὶ ἀσπάλαθοι κομόωντι, which Wendel 1920, 80 had tentatively ascribed to Asclepiades of Myrlea (but see M. Maehler in POxy. LXII (1995), 130) also comes up in an ancient commentary on Theoc. recovered in POxy. 4432.9 (pap. saec. p.C. II). The word in that Theocritean passage is of Battus' painful pricking of his foot by a thorn and the dramatic setting of the idyll is Croton in Sicily.

20.2b. κάκτου This term is introduced into Hellenistic poetry by P. and its rare subsequent occurrences depend on him. As a typical example of his influence, the word vanishes after the next generation of poets. Phaenias of Eresus Περὶ φυτῶν fr. 38 and Theophr. *HP* 6.4.10 say that cactus is confined to Sicily: ἡ δὲ κάκτος καλουμένη περὶ Σικελίαν μόνον, ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν, whence Pliny *NH* 21.97, see F. Olck, *RE* II.2.1455 s.v. Artischocke, Gow on Theoc. 10.4, Lembach 79–80. Epicharmus of Sicily mentioned it several times μετὰ τῶν ἐδωδίμων λαχάνων, fr. 158 (Athen. 2.70d–71a). A. Lindsell, *G&R* 6 (1936), 85 was at a loss with P.'s source of information ("how did Philetas know about the κάκτος if it is a purely

geht die Regsamkeit der Glieder verloren (sie werden starr), mit dem Entfliehen der ψυχή verliert der Körper nicht nur seine Beweglichkeit, sondern alles, was wir als Leben empfinden". On θυμός/ψυχή and animals see S. West on *Od.* 3.455, Bremmer 1983, 125–31 ("The Soul of Plants and Animals"), Caswell 15.

[60] It is a Theocritean practice to employ comparative clauses to insert literary allusions, as e.g. 4.16 (a scraggy calf) μὴ πρῶκας σιτίζεται ὥσπερ ὁ τέττιγξ; hinting at Call. fr. 1.34, or 6.15–7 ὡς ἀπ' ἀκάνθας/ταὶ καπυραὶ χαῖται, τὸ καλὸν θέρος ἀνίκα φρύγει,/καὶ φεύγει φιλέοντα καὶ οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει hinting at Sappho fr. 1.21.

Sicilian plant? [. . .] κάκτος must just be left a mystery."), but it is plain that the Coan knows it from literary sources from Sicily, in which he appears to have had a particular interest (cf. Epich. *ll.ll.*). The geographical restriction of the plant might give its name a glossic character as well. A Syracusan gloss is discussed in *At. Gl.* fr. 38.

20.2c. τύμμα in a poetic context is a medical word, see *LSJ* s.v. and cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1430 (the only attestation in tragedy), Theoc. 4.55, Nic. *Ther.* 6x (403, 426, 653, 737, 919, 930) and fr. 32.4, Androm. *GDRK* 62.12, 87, Argent. *GPh* 2.4 (bee-sting), Marc. Sid. *GDRK* 63.47, 84 (fish-bite) ~ Opp. *Hal.* 2.50, 492, Q.S. 4.396, 401, 404 (in a 'medical' passage, cf. 6.457–8 (Podalirius) τετυμμένα δούρασι φωτῶν/ ἕλκε' ἀκειόμενος), of rain-drops Antiph. *GPh* 9.2. τύπτω is the *vox propria* in Hellenistic poetry for accidental pricking (τυπή mostly denoting an intentional blow), cf. Theoc. 4.53 ἐτύπην, *ibid.* 55 τύμμα and see Gow on Theoc. 4.51 where πατάσσω is employed.

Fr. 21

This fragment is compiled from three different sources, none of them offering an indication as to which poem it belongs. It was first assigned to *Demeter* (as reconstructed from Ovid) by Alfonsi 1954, 211–4. The Homeric Σ quote P. to illustrate the liberal use of ἄορ. POxy. 2260.i.1f. examines δολιχάορος, the striking word of the quotation, as applied to Athena and luckily quotes another line, which is a pentameter. Since the papyrus contains material of theological interest and research based on etymological interpretations, such as Παλλάς from πάλλω in col. ii, Merkelbach 115–7, (cf. *id.* in A. E. Hanson (ed.), *Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts . . . H. C. Youtie* ii, Bonn 1976, 3 and Pfeiffer 1968, 262–3) plausibly assumed that it is derived from Apollodorus' Περὶ θεῶν, against Lobel's identification as a "commentary on a poetic text". The author of the papyrus, after quoting P., goes on to argue on etymological grounds for ἄορ meaning 'sword', not 'spear', and at the end of col. i, ll. 28–30 he adds: οὗτοι μὲν ο[ὖν] | καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλο[ῖς | τὴν τοιαύτην τῶν ὀν[ομάτων (*vac.*). Lobel noted that "the missing accusative may . . be a word for 'ambiguity, confusion, substitution' or the like"; Merkelbach proposed μετάθεσιν. He also identified οὗτοι as "Philitas und der Verfasser der Phoronis". What might be meant by a pupil of Aristarchus are some νεώτεροι poets employing Homeric terms in novel or metaphorical

applications. If so, other passages of theirs could have been quoted. That this passage was soon included in discussions of this kind is indicative of the interest P.'s work elicited in the circles of the grammarians.

The speaker acknowledges the precedence of Athena in Athens (with a pointed hint at her inferiority, see n. 1e), but speaks of Eleusis' principal deity in rather unspecified terms: it may be Demeter proleptically referring to her own central cult-site. As gods usually do, Demeter flies from place to place:[61] from afar she would discern the Acropolis and the Eleusinian hill. Paus. 1.28.2 reports that after the battle of Marathon the Athenians set up on the Acropolis a statue of Athena of which ἡ τοῦ δόρατος αἰχμὴ καὶ ὁ λόφος τοῦ κράνους ἀπὸ Σουνίου προσπλέουσίν ἐστιν ἤδη σύνοπτα. The specific destination may constitute a reference to the *HHD*. Demeter, there under the guise of an old woman, claims to have followed a slightly different route from Crete to the Athenian port of Thoricos and from there to Eleusis (126–130). Athens is in both versions a common stop for a common destination. Above all, Demeter's itinerary bears a remarkable resemblance to that of Mestra when Poseidon carried her away to Cos to bear Eurypylus, Hes. *Cat.* fr. 43a.66–8:

Μήστρη δὲ προ]λιποῦσα Κόων ποτὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν
. . .]ησ ἱερέων ποτὶ γουνὸν Ἀθηνέων
. . . ἐ]πεὶ τέκε παῖδα Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι.

67 νηὶ θοῇ ἐπέρ]ησ' e.g. Merkelbach: βουλῇ Ἀθηναί]ης West

Imminent arrival at Eleusis reveals another detail of importance: Demeter visited Eleusis, her last destination, immediately after her visit to Cos. Thus the Coan cult of the goddess is presented as very closely linked to the Eleusinian one. It moreover sanctions Coan precedence over Eleusinian concerning the seniority of the respective cults. This might be a Philitan response to a proud Coan belief. Such claims of priority in the worship of a deity seem to have been regular. The Sicilians claimed priority over Athens in the benefac-

[61] In *HHD* 43 Demeter sets out looking for her daughter 'like a bird'. Homeric passages on this idea are gathered and discussed in H. Bannert, *Formen der Wiederholung bei Homer*, Vienna 1988, 57–68, see also Hainsworth on *Od.* 5.51. In Call. *HyDem.* 10 Demeter orbits the earth on foot! In Ov. *F.* 4.497, *Met.* 5.642, 648 and Claud. *RP* 1.181–90 she is carried by a chariot led by dragons, see Bömer on *F. l.l.* and Gruzelier on Claud. *l.l.*

tions of Demeter, Diod. Sic. 5.4.4–5. Argos had a similar rivalry with Athens over the establishment of the mysteries. Paus. 1.14.2 Ἑλλήνων οἱ μάλιστα ἀμφισβητοῦντες Ἀθηναίοις ἐς ἀρχαιότητα καὶ δῶρα, <ἃ> παρὰ θεῶν φασιν ἔχειν, εἰσὶν Ἀργεῖοι indicates that other Greek states raised similar claims as well. Cos appears to have had a similar dispute with Epidaurus over the cult of Asclepius (Herzog 173–8).

The position of the verses in *Demeter* seems to be clear: the goddess is departing. It might be part of her reply to Chalcon when, as any willing host, he would ask her to stay for longer. An important stylistic feature of this distich is its air of solemnity and religious gravity (cf. the oracle in n. 1c): there is elevated vocabulary and, unlike other fragments, three grandiose adjj. in two verses. The grandiose tone might have been a feature of Demeter's language, cf. Lycidas, conceivably impersonating many of Demeter's aspects, in Theoc. 7.52–5. The repetition of the same sound-pattern (*Satzparallelismus*) also contributes to this sense of godlike spoken words. This is a well attested Hellenistic technique and a recurrent feature in hymnic/religious language.[62]

21.1a. καί κεν . . ./καί κεν For duplicated καί κεν + optative cf. *Il.* 6.456–7, Simon. *IEG* 22.9f. Here it reproduces the stuttering effect of *HHD* 141–4 where Demeter, as is probable in our passage, reveals future plans (in *HHD* as servant in Celeus' house): καί κεν παῖδα νεογνὸν . . ./καλὰ τιθηνοίμην καὶ δώματα τηρήσαιμι/καί κε λέχος στορέσαιμι . . ./δεσπόσυνον καί κ' ἔργα διδασκήσαιμι γυναῖκας. The use

[62] See Hollis on Call. *Hec.* fr. 75 with a reference to *id.* on Ov. *Met.* 8.628–9. As a feature of religious gravity see E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* ii, Leipzig [3]1913, 841f., Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 267. Cf. e.g. Soph. fr. 957 νὴ τοὺς ἐν Ἄργει καὶ κατὰ Σπάρτην θεούς,/νὴ τὼ Λαπέρσα, νὴ τὸν Εὐρώταν τρίτον, Call. *HyJov.* 87–8, *HyAp.* 16–7, 26–7 ὃς μάχεται μακάρεσσιν, ἐμῷ βασιλῆι μάχοιτο·/ὅστις ἐμῷ βασιλῆι καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι μάχοιτο, *HyDel.* 84–5 (Nymphs' verdict) Νύμφαι μὲν χαίρουσιν, ὅτε δρύας ὄμβρος ἀέξει,/Νύμφαι δ' αὖ κλαίουσιν, ὅτε δρυσὶ μηκέτι φύλλα, *Orac. Sib.* 3.760–1 αὐτὸς γὰρ μόνος ἐστὶ θεὸς κοὐκ ἔστιν ἔτ' ἄλλος/αὐτὸς καὶ πυρὶ φλέξειεν χαλεπῶν γένος ἀνδρῶν and often in Nonn. *D.* (with a parodic touch), as 1.428–9, 3.440–1, 4.294–5 (Pythia prophesies) μαστεύεις τινὰ ταῦρον, ὃν οὐ βοέη τέκε γαστήρ,/μαστεύεις τινὰ ταῦρον, ὃν οὐ βροτὸς οἶδε κιχῆσαι, 8.359–60 (Zeus to Semele) τλῆθι μένειν χρόνον ἄλλον, ἕως ἔτι φόρτον ἀείρεις,/τλῆθι μένειν χρόνον ἄλλον, ἕως ἐμὸν υἷα λοχεύεις, 19.57–8, see Hopkinson on 23.233–233a. A Modern Greek parallel is the repetitive use of similarly sounding pairs of lines in Od. Elytis Ἄξιον Ἐστί in the last part of this composition (Δοξαστικόν) which makes broad use of ecclesiastic features and language.

of anaphora in a short epic catalogue is common, see Mineur on Call. *HyDel.* 70–4. It is a distinct feature of Hellenistic verse, cf. fr. 19 and e.g. Call. *HyJov.* 6–7, 8–9, *HyArt.* 34–5, *HyDel.* 260–4, see for Homeric precedents West on Hes. *WD* 5f. and for late epic C. de Stephani, *A&R* 41 (1996), 36 n. 6. Theoc. more than anyone else made extensive use of different forms of repetition, see Dover xlvi–xlvii.

21.1b. καί κεν Ἀθηναίης Cf. Arat. 529 /οὔ κεν Ἀθηναίης . . δεδιδαγμένος. Aeolic κέν is more frequent than Ionic/Attic ἄν in Homer, A.R. and Call. Juxtaposed with Ionic Ἀθηναίης it produces a dialect contrast which is often a self-conscious play in Hellenistic poetry, cf. Call. *HyJov.* 1–2 Ζηνὸς ἔοι τί κεν ἄλλο παρὰ σπονδῇσιν ἀείδειν/λώϊον, where κεν "provides a contrast for the Ionic ἔοι", McLennan ad loc.

21.1c. Ἀθηναίης δολιχαόρου ἱερὸν ἄστυ Cf. the oracle by the Athenian seer Bacis in Hdt. 8.77.1 Ἀρτέμιδος χρυσαόρου ἱερὸν ἀκτὴν/(= Salamis, cf. Paus. 1.36.1). Euph. *CA* 9.5 *Ἀθ]ηναίης ἱερὴν ἀνελύσατο κίστην/ and Call. fr. 384.35 **καὶ παρ' Ἀθηναίοις* γὰρ ἐπὶ στέγος *ἱερὸν* ἧνται may recall P., cf. also *Od.* 6.321–2 ἄλσος/ἱρὸν Ἀθηναίης.

21.1d. Ἀθηναίης The short Ionic form Ἀθήνη and this long one coexist in Hellenistic verse along with Doric Ἀθηναία. The latter is inscriptionally attested up to the 3rd cent. BC and is the form mostly used in classical Athens, see Threatte i, 271f., Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 828. Koine uses by then only Ἀθηνᾶ, see Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 5. The form here is in its usual *sedes.*

21.1e. Ἀθηναίης δολιχαόρου secures Athena's inferiority by pointedly alluding to Demeter's traditional *HHD* 4, *al.* χρυσάορος. As we learn from POxy. 2260.i.1 the adj. was first used of Athena in *Phoronis EGF* 5. Athena, predominantly a war-goddess (Hes. *Theog.* 925f.), is regularly represented in art and literature as handling a long spear.[63] In *Il.* 5.745–6 = 8.389–90 Athena brandishes an ἔγχος/ βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, a formula elsewhere applied only to Achilleus, cf. also Athena's πελώριον ἔγχος in *Il.* 8.424 and in *Od.* 1.99–100 her ἄλκιμον ἔγχος . . ./βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν which Aristarchus condemned as

---

[63] See P. Demargne, *LIMC* II.1, 969f. with vol. 2, 716f. and H. G. Niemeyer, *Promachos. Untersuchungen zur Darstellung der bewaffneten Athena in archaischer Zeit,* Waldsassen 1960, 32f., H. Walter, *Griechische Götter,* Munich 1971, 217–50.

a loan from the *Il.* In *Il.* 18.517 Ares and Pallas lead an army on Achilleus' shield καλὼ καὶ μεγάλω σὺν τεύχεσιν, cf. also Hermod. *HE* 1.3 τὰν δ' ἐν Κεκροπίδαις δορυθαρσέα Παλλάδα, Claud. *Gig.* 38 θεὰ . . δορυσσόος. Such an attribute may well have an artistic background.

21.1f. Ἀθηναίης . . . ἄστυ is an Attic expression, cf. Eur. *Med.* 771 ἄστυ καὶ πόλισμα Παλλάδος, *GVI* 984.5 (Athens, 2nd cent. AD) ἄστυ Ἀθήνης/, Nonn. *D.* 19.117, *al.* ἀστὸς Ἀθήνης/, Moschio *TrGF* 97 F 4.3 ἀστοῖς Ἀθάνας with Th. K. Stephanopoulos, *Archaeognosia* 9 (1995–96), 152, Hor. *C.* 1.7.5 *intactae Palladis urbem*, see further n. 2b. An inscription of the 5th cent. BC found in Cos (perhaps originally from Samos), *IdC* EV 361, runs hόρος τ̣έ̣μ̣|ενος Ἀθην|ᾶς Ἀθηνῶν| μεδεόσης.

21.1g. δολιχαόρου occurs only in *Phoronis EGF* 5 and here, both supplied by the same source.[64] The adj. is equivalent to the absolute hapax *Il.* 21.155 δολιχεγχής. Its second component is the obsolete word ἄορ, which was soon lost in the vernacular and was felt to be archaistic, cf. [Plut.] *De Hom.* 14. ἄορ is very rare after Homer: Hes. *Theog.* 283, [*id.*] *Scut.* 221, 257, Eur. *El.* 476 (lyr.), resurrected in Imperial epic. It is usually identified as ξίφος, φάσγανον, Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 3.271b (I.407 Erbse, *q.v.*), see Theodoridis on Phot. *Lex.* α 2197. As, however, Arcadian and Aetolian usage extended its meaning to cover every implement, P. uses it here of Athena's long spear, cf. EtM α 1504 ἄορ· . . . τὸ ξίφος, ὅπλον, δόρυ.[65] The author of *Phoronis* and P. evidently agreed with those who interpreted Apollo's disputed epithet χρυσάορος as 'with long spear'.[66] P. could have brought forward his interpretation relying on the dialectal meaning of ἄορ in

---

[64] In Euph. *SH* 415.i.22]χάορος (probably of Orion) Latte proposed δολ]ι̣χάορος printed by van Groningen in his fr. 24c.22: "legi nequit δολ]ι̣χάορος", *SH* ad loc. considering ἀ]γχάορος, for which A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 89 (1991), 30 n. 8 adduced Hor. *C.* 1.28.21 *devexi . . . Orionis/.*

[65] The second component of δολιχεγχής, the model of δολιχάορος, means 'spear' in Homer, but can denote any weapon — including swords (Soph. *Aj.* 95, *al.*) — in tragedy. So its meaning in Homer was disputed in pre-Aristarchan scholarship (Lehrs 47), cf. Σ A *Il.* 7.255a (II.270 Erbse) δολίχ' ἔγχεα: ὅτι κυρίως ἔγχη τὰ δόρατα, οὐχ ὥς τινες τὰ ξίφη. For a similar difference in meaning cf. fr. 12.2b δειλαίων.

[66] "An unexpected attribute for a god whose typical weapon is the bow", Kirk on *Il.* 5.508–11. Similar terms apply to Artemis, Orpheus and Perseus. The exact meaning of these cultic attributes was disputed, see Richardson on *HHD* 4. On ἄορ see *LFrE* s.v., Rengakos 1992, 38, M. Hillgruber, *Die Pseudoplutarchische Schrift* De Homero, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1994, 122–3.

his scholarly works, treating in particular *Il.* 14.385 (Poseidon holding) δεινὸν ἄορ τανύηκες. Call. *HyDel.* 31 ἄορι τριγλώχινι of Poseidon's trident may rely on that entry to employ the term with elasticity (see C. M. Bowra, *Glotta* 38 (1960), 52; with its usual meaning in *Hec.* fr. 10.2). Opp. *Hal.* 2.465, *al.* employs it metaphorically of the swordfish's muzzle, [*id.*] *Cyn.* 2.533 of the horn of rhinoceros.

21.1h. ἱερόν 'under divine protection'. ἱερός is freely attributed to persons and things with a divine link (Burkert 1985, 269) and it is a common attribute to geographical places,[67] but it is particularly appropriate of Athens, which, in a long-established tradition, is both ἱεραί and ἄστυ, cf. *Od.* 11.323 ἐς γοῦνον Ἀθηνάων ἱεράων (= Acropolis; probably an Attic interpolation), Hes. fr. 43a.67, 146, Pind. fr. 75.4, Bacch. 18.1, 23.1, Soph. *Aj.* 1221–22, Eur. *Med.* 825–6, Timocr. *PMG* 727.3, 'Simon.' *FGE* 64.1, Q.S. 8.358, Nonn. *D.* 19.82, see further P. Wülfing-von Martitz, *Glotta* 38 (1960), 284 n. 3, Olson on Ar. *Pax* 1034 τὴν ἱερὰν πόλιν.

21.1i. ἱερὸν ἄστυ/ is unHomeric, though Homer has ἱερὴν πόλιν ("an unusual phrase", Kirk on *Il.* 1.366), ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον and comes quite close in *Il.* 4.103 = 121 ἱερῆς εἰς ἄστυ Ζελείης/, 21.128 ἄστυ . . Ἰλίου ἱρῆς, see further Campbell on Q.S. 12.235. — ι- in ἱερόν is short by nature. Metrically lengthened it can become long, which is the norm in the fifth foot. In its dactylic form it usually precedes a noun (only four exceptions in Homer), see Hopkinson 1984, 46 and on v. 40, Kidd on Arat. 215. For the rare clausula ἱερὸν ἄστυ (here, Q.S., late oracles and inscriptions) see Campbell *l.l.* (add Theodot. *SH* 757.7 and perhaps *SEG* 27.405.6 (3rd cent. AD) Βειlθυ[νίδος εἱερὸν] ἄστυ/) and for (δολιχα)όρου ἱερὸν ἄστυ cf. perhaps Call. *HyDel.* 70 ὄρος ἱερὸν Αὔγης, *id. HyDem.* 40 ξύλον ἱερὸν ἄλγει. For the metrical scheme – ⏑⏑ (adj.) ἄστυ/ (unattested before 'Theogn.') cf. Theogn. 785 = Anon. PVind. Rainer 29801.66 Bernsdorff, *q.v.* (pap. saec. p.C. III) = Adesp. *GDRK* 17A.17 ἀγλαὸν ἄστυ/, Antim. fr. 28.2 Δύμιον ἄστυ/, Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1177 = Q.S. 3.29 = 4.478 = *IMEG* 140.3 = 145.3 (both late Imperial) ὄλβιον ἄστυ/ (a rare expression, see Campbell on Q.S. 12.78), Call. fr. 43.46 κεί͜μεν͜ον ἄστυ/ (for

[67] See P. Wülfing-von Martitz, *Glotta* 38 (1960), 278–88, Kirk on *Il.* 4.378, St. Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City*, Ithaca-London 1990, 16–40, Mineur on Call. *HyDel.* 1. On its range of meanings see J. Chadwick, *Lexicographica Graeca*, Oxford 1996, 150–61.

the text see G. Massimilla, *ZPE* 81 (1990), 18), A.R. 4.274 μυρία δ' ἄστη/, [Mosch.] *EB* 90 Τήιον ἄστυ/, Triph. 395 πάτριον ἄστυ/, Q.S. 1.52, *al.* Τρώϊον ἄστυ/, 4.451, *al.* κύδιμον ἄστυ/.[68] In Homer always ⏑⏑ ἄστυ/ (11x), cf. though *Il.* 11.706 ἀμφί τε ἄστυ/, *Od.* 18.1 ὃς κατὰ ἄστυ/.

21.1j. ἄστυ is a *vox propria* of Athens from classical times onwards, after the synoecism. It was regarded as being the first ἄστυ and then the ἄστυ *par excellence* in the Greek world, cf. Hecataeus of Abdera *FGrH* 264 F 25.28(4) παρὰ μόνοις . . τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν πόλιν ἄστυ καλεῖσθαι, Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 2 Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πρῶτοι τῶν ἄλλων ἄστη καὶ πόλεις ᾤκησαν with Jacoby ad loc., Steph. Byz. 34.5 Ἀθῆναι· [. . .] ἀστὰς δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας ἔλεγον . . . ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀστοὺς ἐκάλουν. πρῶτοι γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ ἄστη καὶ τὰς πόλεις εὑρεῖν ἱστοροῦνται, *id.* 70.20 Ἀλεξάνδρειαι· [. . .] ἐλέγετο δὲ κατ' ἐξοχὴν πόλις καὶ πολῖται <οἱ> (add. Marzullo *ap.* Codecà, *MCr* 8–9 (1973–4), 237 n. 2) ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἄστυ αἱ Ἀθῆναι καὶ ἀστοὶ καὶ ἀστικοί οἱ Ἀθηναῖαι. Strictly speaking, its use here is anachronistic: before synoecism ἡ ἀκρόπολις ἡ νῦν οὖσα πόλις ἦν, καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν πρὸς νότον μάλιστα τετραμμένον (Thuc. 2.15.3), but the meaning of ἄστυ was disputed, cf. Hsch. α 7930 ἄστυ· πόλις, ἡ ἀκρόπολις, Steph. Byz. 139.12 s.v. ἄστυ, Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1100.1f. (IV.30 van der Valk). The sacred olive-tree on the Acropolis was called ἀστὴ ἐλαία (Adesp. *PCG* 810).

21.2a. Ἐλευσῖνος θεῖον . . λόφον Cf. *HHD* 318 πτολίεθρον Ἐλευσῖνος θυοέσσης ~ 490. Demeter evidently refers to the hill where, in *HHD* 272, she ordered Celeus to build her temple. Eleusis' hill is proleptically holy even before Demeter sees it. The anachronism finds a precedent in *HHD* 97 = 318 = 490 Ἐλευσῖνος θυοέσσης (and with the name Καλλίχορος in 272), see Richardson on v. 97. Erudite poets deliberately indulge in such lapses: A.R. 1.1092 Αἰσονίδη, χρειώ σε τόδ' ἱερὸν εἰσανιόντα etc. anticipates the sanctuary of Rhea which

[68] The metrical structure – ⏑⏑ ἄστυ/ may occur from Hellenistic hexameters onwards with nouns or verbs in which case an adj. often precedes, cf. A.R. 1.794 ναίεται ἄστυ/, Maiist. 9 (*CA*, 69) ἤλυθεν ἄστυ/, *SEG* 38.731.5 (*c.* 194 BC) ἵξομαι ἄστυ/, *SEG* 30.182.1 (Athens, Roman times) Κέκρο]πος ἄσ[τυ/, Q.S. 9.327 Ἰλίου ἄστυ/, Orph. *Arg.* 145 ἔκτισεν ἄστυ/, Musae. 74 ἔδρακον ἄστυ/, Dion. Per. 264 ἔλλαχον ἄστυ/, *SEG* 36.1345.2 (6th cent. AD) Καίσαρος ἄστυ/. ἄστυ is never clausular in Nonnus.

the Argonauts will later found. A.R. 4.659–60 ἁλὸς . . ./Αὐσονίης dates Ausones in Argonautic times, as the Σ ad loc. note. Call. *Hec.* fr. 71.2–3 Λυκείου/καλὸν . . . κατὰ δρόμον Ἀπόλλωνος refers to the Gymnasium of Lycaean Apollo in Erichthonius' time. Q.S. 12.90 alludes to siege-engines used in the Trojan war. The phenomenon was later trivialised by the Romans, see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 2.795, Campbell on Q.S. *l.l.* and on anachronisms in tragedy with reference to Homer P. E. Easterling, *JHS* 105 (1985), 1–11.

21.2b. Ἐλευσῖνος . . . λόφον i.e. Eleusis. Eleusis, 21 km west of Athens, is built at the seashore, beneath a hill, in imposing scenery. What is perhaps meant here is the eponymous hero Eleusis who, according to one version, was himself the recipient of Demeter.[69] Ἐλευσῖνος . . . λόφον corresponds to Ἀθηναίης . . . ἄστυ and for λόφον cf. Hes. *Theog.* 54 Μνημοσύνη, γουνοῖσιν Ἐλευθῆρος μεδέουσα. The practice of naming cities by their eponymous heroes is particularly liked by Hellenistic poets with antiquarian interests, cf. A.R. 1.186 πτολίεθρον ἀγαυοῦ Μιλήτοιο, 2.1186 ~ 3.265–6 πόλιν Ὀρχομενοῖο,/ὅς τις ὅδ' Ὀρχομενός, 3.1094–95, Rhian. *CA* 60 Ἐχίονος ἄστυ (a town in Acarnania), Erat. *CA* 23 Θορικοῦ καλὸν . . ἕδος (on this formulation see Meineke on Steph. Byz. s.v. ἄστυ, p. 140.4 adding *Il.* 24.544, *HHAp.* 37 and see A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 93 (1992), 9), Opp. *Hal.* 5.521–2 Βύζαντος . ./ἄστυ, Nonn. *D.* 13.79 ἐπώνυμον ἄστυ Κορώνου. In Theoc. 1.147 ἀπ' Αἰγίλω = ἀπ' Αἰγιαλίας, Call. *HyDel.* 71 φεῦγεν δ' ὁ γέρων μετόπισθε Φενειός, and perhaps A.R. 3.1073 ἢ νύ που ἀφνειοῦ σχεδὸν ἵξεαι Ὀρχομενοῖο the eponymous hero stands for the name of the place. This way of mentioning a town artificially gives the impression of an era in which places did not yet have their final names.

21.2c. θεῖον 'consecrated (to Demeter)', here a synonym of the previous ἱερόν, cf. [Theoc.] 25.10 ἱερὸν θείοιο παρὰ ῥόον Ἀλφειοῖο. Here it conforms with its normal Homeric placing, following names

---

[69] Cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 147, Servius on Virg. *G.* 1.19. Panyas. *EGF* 21 made him father of Triptolemus, another recipient of Demeter in Eleusis (on him S. B. Matheson, *GRBS* 35 (1994), 345–72). On the eponymous hero of Eleusis see Richardson on *HHD* 105, E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica*, London 1989, 98 with n. 96, 158–9. On the scansion of his name see Powell on Erat. *CA* 16.18. Paus. 1.38.7 Ἐλευσῖνα δὲ ἥρωα, ἀφ' οὗ τὴν πόλιν ὀνομάζουσιν, οἱ μὲν Ἑρμοῦ παῖδα εἶναι καὶ Δαείρας Ὠκεανοῦ θυγατρὸς λέγουσι, τοῖς δέ ἐστι πεποιημένα Ὤγυγον εἶναι πατέρα Ἐλευσῖνι indicates that he became a subject in (local?) poetry.

scanning ⏑ – – –, see Hainsworth on *Il.* 11.806 and cf., further, A.R. 2.613 ἐνέπνευσεν θεῖον μένος. This is not normally the case in Hellenistic verse. In early epic the adj. usually applies to men ('god-like') and only rarely to things, see Ll-J on Semon. *Females of the Species* 89. It occurs less often in tragedy (Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 1547).

21.2d. θεῖον . . λόφον may be an echo of the Homeric application of θεῖος to things, *Od.* 4.43 θεῖον δόμον, *Od.* 2.341 = 9.205 θεῖον πότον, *Od.* 8.264 χορὸν θεῖον, cf. A.R. 2.1091 ~ 1.970 θεῖον στόλον. The combination is unHomeric, but since peaks of hills were early enough used as sanctuaries (Burkert 1985, 26–8, Parker 1996, 29–33), mountains or hills are often said to be ζάθεον or ἱερόν (Mineur on Call. *HyDel.* 70–1).

21.2e. ἴδοι[μι Demeter, as if stuttering, uses recurring καί κεν clauses as a personal formula, see n. 1a. The first person seems therefore certain.

II. *Reconstruction of* Demeter

In three fragments in Stobaeus (frr. 9, 12, 13) and in a marginal Σ on Call. *HyAp.* 33 (fr. 16) the title of the poem is attested as Δημήτηρ. These are the only fragments *expressis verbis* attributed to it. In 1829 Bach 25 discussed the alleged content of *Demeter* in one paragraph assuming, as others before and after him, the poem to have contained the typical features of the Demeter-myth: rape of Core and wanderings of Demeter. Speculation started soon after. From Ovid *F.* 4.417–620 and *Met.* 5.341–571 Förster 72 posited that P. followed the Sicilian version. Maass 1895a, vii–x maintained that the poem was a *recantatio* of the *HHD* with Eleusis as the scene of the action and the characters of the *HHD* as protagonists. He propounded a reconstitution of P.'s poem from Ov. *F. l.l.* and considered frr. 12 and 13, which he published as one, as Celeus' consolation of Demeter.[70] Cessi 1908, 122–37, keeping to the same line, reconstructed *Demeter* on the basis of Ovid's treatments of the Demeter-myth. Pohlenz 35–6 with n. 3, Kuchenmüller 53–8 (and von Blumenthal 2167–68)

---

[70] His paper was influential, cf. Sitzler, *JAW* 104 (1898), 93 and Cessi 1908, 122–5; *contra*: H. Stadtmüller, *BPhW* 15 (1897), 452.

objected to the suggestion that Ovid used P. as a source. Cessi's view found sympathy with Day 14–6 and with Nowacki 40–5. The latter deemed that the poem focused on Demeter's wanderings in various places and, since the three *Demeter*-fragments in Stobaeus are of lamenting content, accepted an earlier proposal of O. Crusius (*RE* V.2.2279) that *Demeter* is a *paramytheticon* like Antim.'s *Lyde*. Speculation was then diverted in other directions.

M. Haupt on Ov. *Met.* 5.385–408 considered P. or Call. as possible sources for Ovid's *Fasti*-version, but see von Albrecht's updated note on 5.341–661. G. Lafaye (*Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leur modèles grecs*, Paris 1904, 190 n. 1) tentatively identified Ovid's direct model as a lost part of Call. *Aetia*. L. Malten, "Ein Alexandrinisches Gedicht vom Raub der Kore", *Hermes* 45 (1910), 506–53, in a way typical of his times (see R. F. Thomas, *CPh* 85 (1990), 78), postulated the existence of a lost Hellenistic intermediary poem known to Ovid through Call. As Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 611 noted, "hoc multis probavit . . . at ne minima quidem ex parte confirmatum est". E. Bethe, "Ovid und Nikander", *Hermes* 39 (1904), 1–4 proposed Nic. as the only model of Ovid relying on Ant. Lib. 24 (Nic. fr. 56). His view was further developed by K. Barwick, *Philologus* 80 (1925), 455–66. H. Herter, "Ovids Persephone Erzählungen und ihre hellenistischen Quellen", *RhM* n.s. 90 (1941), 236–68 stood between both tendencies: in *Fasti* Ovid uses mostly Call. and in *Met.* mostly Nic. in a version intermediated to him from Call. In this he follows an older distinction by Förster 74–80, cf. *id.* 84–8, 293–6. He also observed that there is "keine wirkliche deutliche Entsprechung" of P. in Ovid. Richardson 1974, 72 concluded that Ovid "knew and imitated the [Homeric] Hymns directly", cf. also W. S. Anderson, *Gnomon* 61 (1989), 356–7. The fact was curiously denied by Herter, *l.c.*, 253, but a detailed examination by Hinds 51f., 72f. revealed striking similarities and established the *HHD* as the main source of Ovid.

Summa summarum Ovid's usefulness with regard to P. would come into question as a testimony via a third source, whether that was an Alexandrian poem or a commentary on it. The *Fasti* provides a more appropriate form to accommodate Hellenistic aetiological interests. One may approach in this respect Demeter's medical/magical capability in 4.529–42, the end of fasting with poppy-seeds heralded by the appearance of Hesperus in 4.535–6 or the offering of milk and honey by Demeter's hosts in 4.545–6. Most of these features, in their seminal form, appear in the *HHD*.

The crucial information on *Demeter* seems to be provided by Σ Theoc. 7.5–9f (79.6 Wendel) about Chalcon and Antagoras, the two sons of the Coan king Eurypylus:

> οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἡρακλέους πολιορκίας τὴν Κῶ κατοική-σαντες καὶ ὑποδεδεγμένοι τὴν Δήμητραν, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν περιῄει τὴν Κόρην ζητοῦσα.

The Σ on Theoc. 7 tell us more about *Demeter* than any other single source. This Σ is the only attestation of Demeter's visit to Cos and, as G. Knaack in Susemihl i, 177 n. 17 first suggested, it seems to epitomise the content of P.'s poem. Two incidents are picked out: Chalcon and Antagoras' confrontation with Heracles when he landed on Cos and the reception of Demeter as a guest when she was visiting places looking for Persephone. It is, nevertheless, uncertain whether these were of equal weight in *Demeter.*

It emerges that we are dealing with a poem of local character. It follows the typical story-line of Demeter visiting a place where she is eagerly welcomed, founds her cult and benefits the local population in different ways. Such provincial traditions legitimise Demeter's local cult and make up a kind of aetium for it, cf., for example, Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 89 for Paros, Paus. 2.18.3, 35.4, 7.27.9 for Argos, Paus. 1.37.2 for Attica, all with local kings as protagonists, see further Richardson 1974, 178–9. The poets attended to them. The canonical, i.e. Eleusinian, version had always been a popular theme after *HHD* and it was especially popular in Hellenistic poetry.[71] Some poets coming from regions with a widespread and ancient cult of Demeter versified the local version as a variation of the better-known Eleusinian one. So Pindar fr. 37 might have given preponderance to the Theban elements in his *Hymn to Persephone* (or *Hymn to Demeter*): Θηβαίοις εἰς Δήμητρα Θεσμοφόρον is the title offered by the *Vita Ambrosiana.* Parallel to P. is Lasus of Hermione ἐν τῷ εἰς τὴν ἐν Ἑρμιόνι Δήμητρα ὕμνῳ, which enjoyed some popularity in Hellenistic times (*PMG* 702 ~ Call. *Hec.* fr. 100, Philic. *SH* 676). The cult of Demeter Chthonia in Hermione was eminent (cf. Paus. 2.35.4–9 and see Farnell iii, 320 n. 37, Pfeiffer on Call. *Hec.* fr. 278),

---

[71] The evidence is gathered in Förster 29–98 (now to be consulted with caution), Richardson 1974, 68–73 and Foley 30–1. Cf. Antim. *Lyde* frr. 78, 79, P., Call. *HyDem.*, fr. 611 and probably fr. 474, Nic. *Ther.* 483–7, *Alex.* 129–32, Philic. *SH* 676–80, Adesp. Pap. *SH* 990 and Pamphus in Paus. 1.38.3, 7.37.9, *al.*

and local traditions would supply Lasus with the necessary material.

That P. wrote a poem about Demeter's advent to his own homeland is, then, no innovation. The goddess' cult in Cos, one of the earliest, is widely attested.[72] Looking at the surviving fragments of P. with this perspective in mind, one notices that some are related to Cos and some others to traditional features of Demeter's distressed behaviour. They fall into four categories. There are a. fragments describing a Coan locality which when combined constitute a *locus amoenus*: a shady plane-tree (fr. 8), ample water-flow (fr. 7), the spring Bourina (fr. 6) and bees (fr. 14), b. a group of fragments related to a lamentation scene (frr. 9, 10, 11), followed by weeping, a consolation effort, both in direct speech, and subsequent relief (frr. 12, 13), and c. a group of fragments describing ordinary activities of female servants in a regal house (fr. 17), a feast with piping (fr. 20) and with wine (fr. 19) and fish (fr. 18) on the table. Another fragment (21) is part of a departing scene, apparently of Demeter moving towards Athens and Eleusis. Some fragments seem to allude to Coan practices in the cult of Demeter (frr. 8, 17) and many mention famous Coan products (fr. 17 flocks and wool, fr. 19 wine, fr. 14 honey, fr. 18 fish), most of which have a significance in the goddess' worship. Set in their traditional epic context, these scattered elements would yield a more complete picture. The gaps in the following reconstruction may be supplemented with information elicited by the influence of the poem on, above all, Theocritus and Callimachus.

We cannot tell with certainty in what circumstances Chalcon and Demeter met. Their meeting scene might have taken place in the area of Bourina and might have been modelled on *HHD* 98f., where the daughters of Celeus meet disguised Demeter ἐγγὺς ὁδοῖο . . ./Παρθενίῳ φρέατι as they walk there to fetch water. In the typology of meeting-scenes wells often serve as accidental meeting points, cf. *Od.* 9.105, 15.441, 17.212 (this passage is significant: P. seems to have drawn on it for the scenery around Bourina). Note that in Theoc. 7.10f. Simichidas meets Lycidas at noon-time, when theophanies usually take place,[73] right after a reference to Bourina. Such a placing would have a significant impact on Call. fr. 2.1–2, specifying Hesiod's

[72] See Fraser ii, 916 n. 290, Sh-W 305–12, Craik 188–9 and for the numerous inscriptions *id.* 216–7.

[73] For noon-time theophanies cf. Theoc. 7.10f., 21, 1.15–8, Call. *HyPal.* 70–3 with Bulloch on v. 72, A.R. 4.1312, see Th. D. Papanghelis, *Mnemosyne* iv 92 (1989), 54–61. Meeting scenes usually follow a rigid pattern, see Richardson 1974, 179–80 and 339–43 (Appendix iii), F. Williams, *MPhL* 3 (1978), 219–35.

meeting with the Muses in the area of Hippocrene at noon time, cf. also Prop. T. 23d.1–2 *Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra/ Bellerophontei qua fluit umor equi* and note that Ovid *Am.* 3.1.3 met Elegy in a grove with a *fons sacer in medio.*

The assumption that Lycidas' description in Theoc. 7 bears vestiges from Demeter's description at her meeting with Chalcon in P. gains colour from the fact that Lycidas is introduced with the unmistakable features of disguised gods who meet mortals as they find themselves on a journey.[74] That Lycidas is not a mere goatherd is insinuated in 14 αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ' ἐῴκει, where ἔξοχ', as usual, means '*prae ceteris*', not '*maxime*' (Gow ad loc.) and by the epiphanic ἐῴκει implying opposition to reality (S. Goldhill, *PCPS* 32 (1986), 37). In 11–2 Lycidas is described as καί τιν' ὁδίταν/ἐσθλὸν Κυδωνικὸν εὕρομες ἄνδρα. Lycidas, as Demeter, is *prima vista* a wayfarer. For his Cydonian/ Cretan origin cf. that the Odyssean characters assuming a fictitious identity often claim to have come from Crete and esp. that disguised Demeter in *HHD* 123 reaches Eleusis Κρήτηθεν. For an echo of Lycidas' sudden, unexpected emergence cf. Philetas' similar appearances in Long. 2.3.1 τερπομένοις δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐφίσταται πρεσβύτης etc., 2.32.1 καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐφίσταται ὁ βουκόλος Φιλητᾶς etc. and their echo in Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13.2 Νικίας δ' ὁ λάσταυρος οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν ἐπανιών 'ποῦ' φησιν ἡμῖν 'ἀθρόαι; τίνος ἄπιτε ἐκπιεῖν ἀγρόν;' and in the un-Callimachean topos of the sudden appearances of Phoebus to Roman poets (Heyworth 201).

In the description of Lycidas in Theoc. 7.15–6 εἶχε τράγοιο/. . δέρμ' ὤμοισι and of Demeter in Call. *HyDem.* 44 κατωμαδίαν δ' ἔχε κλᾷδα (cf. Hsch. κ 2954 κλῇδες· . . . παρὰ Ἐφεσίοις τῆς θεοῦ τὰ στέμματα) a garment on the shoulders of these figures is attented to, as with Demeter in *HHD* 42 κυάνεον δὲ κάλυμμα κατ' ἀμφοτέρων βάλετ' ὤμων. Theoc.'s adaptation here is not hard to imagine: Demeter's divine odour from her fine garment (*HHD* 277–8 ὀδμὴ δ' ἱμερόεσσα θυηέντων ἀπὸ πέπλων/σκίδνατο) is here reduced to Lycidas' stench from his rustic tunic, 15–6 ἐκ μὲν γὰρ λασίοιο δασύτριχος εἶχε τράγοιο/ κνακὸν δέρμ' ὤμοισι νέας ταμίσοιο ποτόσδον. For Lycidas' γέρων . .

---

[74] Lycidas possesses evident divine qualities: he is introduced in 14 with expressions in Homer applying only to gods, never to mortals (see Puelma 1960, 148–50, Arnott 1984, 339), he appears suddenly at noon time, he smiles, has no specific destination, addresses only one of the three wayfarers and disappears suddenly, see A. Cameron in *Studi. . . A. Rostagni*, Torino 1963, 291–307, Pearce 277–87, Hunter 1999, 147. Bowie 67–80 (followed by Thomas 35f.) held Lycidas as a figure in bucolic poetry of P. set in Lesbos.

πέπλος in 17, a bizzare term for what Lycidas wears, cf. *HHD l.c.*, 182–3 πέπλος/κυάνεος, 360, *al.* κυανόπεπλος, perhaps Philic. *SH* 680.7]ωστọ χιτὼν ἀμπ[εχ-, and esp. Theoc. 7.33 εὐπέπλῳ Δαμάτερι, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.9 (Elegy's) *vestis tenuissima.* The meaning of 18 ζωστῆρι πλακερῷ is not known, as this attribute to Lycidas' belt does not occur anywhere else (πλατεῖ Σ 18a, 84.9 Wendel). Lycidas' stick of wild olive, his smiling face and sparkling eyes may also be indebted to features of Philitan Demeter in the meeting scene with Chalcon, see p. 249f.

It is in the same environs and with the same features that Ovid meets Elegy in *Am.* 3.1.1–10, in a grove which the poet visits in order to draw inspiration for his elegies. This programmatic passage seems to reproduce features which draw their origin in P.'s *Demeter* and had an impact on Call. and Theoc.:

Stat vetus et multos incaedua silva per annos;
credibile est illi numen inesse loco.
fons sacer in medio speluncaque pumice pendens,
et latere ex omni dulce queruntur aves.
Hic ego dum spatior tectus nemoralibus umbris,
quod mea, quaerebam, Musa moveret opus;
venit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos,
et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat.
forma decens, vestis tenuissima, vultus amantis,
et pedibus vitium causa decoris erat.

In theophanies, gods are identified by some supernatural token (Burkert 1985, 187), which in *Demeter* may have been her very Coan apparel. It may be that Chalcon recognised her as a goddess on the spot. Note that after a short description of Lycidas, Simichidas immediately recognises him, 13–4 ἦς δ' αἰπόλος, οὐδέ κέ τίς νιν/ἠγνοίησεν ἰδών, ἐπεὶ αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ' ἐῴκει. Contrast *HHD* 111 (Celeus' daughters) οὐδ' ἔγνων· χαλεποὶ δὲ θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν ὁρᾶσθαι, but cf. *HHD* 159 δὴ γὰρ θεοείκελός ἐσσι. This may be a modification on the part of P. to stress Chalcon's piety: the gods reveal themselves not to just anyone, but to those whom they favour (the θεοφιλεῖς), see R. Pfister, *RE Suppl.* IV.319–20 and note in particular Call. *HyAp.* 9 ὡπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται, ἀλλ' ὅτις ἐσθλός. Fr. 13 reads better if Demeter's identity is known.

When Chalcon met Demeter he was perhaps in search of water. Note that Celeus' daughters in *HHD* 106–7 see Demeter ἐρχόμεναι μεθ' ὕδωρ εὐήρυτον ὄφρα φέροιεν/. . . φίλα πρὸς δώματα πατρός and

that in Prop. T. 23d.25f. Calliope soaked the lips of the poet with 'Philitan water' *lymphisque a fonte petitis*, and after Apollo had led him to the Muses' grotto through a long untrodden path. This may mean that the Coan king might have undertaken an expedition around the town of Cos in search of a water source. At his request Demeter may have pin-pointed Bourina's exact position, so that the creation of the spring might be due to the goddess' beneficial advice, see fr. 6. Σ on 5–9o (81.9 Wendel) say that ἀνηγγέλθη τῷ βασιλεῖ παρά τινος τῶν περὶ ταῦτα δεινῶν, ὅτι ὕδατος ὁ τόπος ἐκεῖνος ἐνδομυχεῖ. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτεπιστατήσας τῷ τόπῳ ηὐτούργησεν, ὅσα συνέτεινε πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος ἔκρηξιν.

It is possible that the motif of Apollo leading P. through a long untrodden path in Prop. T. 23d goes back to P., as Demeter, on Chalcon's request, might have shown Bourina to him by leading him through a narrow untrodden path (and conceivably after warning him that he will not find water if he follows the well-trodden way, cf. Call. *l.s.*). The obscure information in the Theocritean Σ concerning the creation of Bourina, which can not apply to ἐκ ποδός which it is supposed to explain, may then echo a good, and ancient, source, 7.5–9l (80.6 Wendel) ἐκ ποδὸς ἄνυε· . . . ἢ ἔξω τῆς πεπατημένης ὁδοῦ, *ibid.* o (82.9 Wendel) εἰσὶ δὲ οἵτινες τὸ 'ἐκ ποδὸς' ἐνόησαν τὸ ἔξω τῆς πεπατημένης ὁδοῦ, λέγοντες ὅτι ἡ πηγή, περὶ ἧς ὁ λόγος, οὐκ ἦν κατὰ τὴν δημοσίαν ὁδόν, ἀλλ' ἐκτός. The symbolism of this scene and its impact on Call. is apparent, esp. in fr. 1.27–8 δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους/ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις. For the unPindaric στεινοτέρην cf. Prop. T. 23d.26 *nova . . semita*, Σ Theoc. 7.5–9n (of Chalcon) οἱ στενωποὺς ὀρύσσοντες. This may be the origin of the motif of a god (or goddess/Muse) showing a poet the way to an untrodden path. The fact that in Prop. that role is performed by Apollo indicates his reception from Call. The motif is then employed by Virg. *E.* 6.64–5 (Silenus) *canit, errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum/Aonas in montis ut duxerit una sororum.* Apollo's address to Prop. T. 23d.15 *quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine?* is particularly appropriate to these circumstances and may represent a contrast between a large river and a pure spring which featured in P. before Call. *HyAp.* 105f. took it up.[75] The appearance of Demeter

[75] Could it be that Prop. T. 23c.6 *quamque bibistis aquam?* alludes to a similar ambiguity in Call.? Its twin question *quove pede ingressi?* seems to allude to a very real interpretative question regarding Demeter's entrance in Chalcon's palace, see

as a patron of good poetry and her direct association with Apollo in *HyAp.* 105f. would owe a lot to this Philitan passage.

So, the poem might have begun with a very influential scene in the countryside. In the area of Bourina exhausted Demeter and Chalcon rest under the shade of a plane-tree (fr. 8). The classic needs of wayfarers are shade and water and plane-trees are most suitable in this respect. They were regarded, as indeed they are, as beautiful trees (Schönbeck 49–51, Meiggs 276–7), which were correctly believed to grow near sources of water (Theophr. *HP* 1.4.2, 4.8.1), so that plane-trees and springs, rivulets etc. appear together in ideal sceneries as early as *Il.* 2.507 καλῇ ὑπὸ πλατανίστῳ, ὅθεν ῥέεν ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ, cf. also Theogn. 882, Plato *Phdr.* 230b, Mosch. fr. 1.11–2, Tiberius Ilus *FGE* 6.3. In Plato *Phdr.* 229b Socrates explains the advantages of sitting under a plane-tree at midday: ἐκεῖ σκιά τ' ἐστὶν καὶ πνεῦμα μέτριον, καὶ πόα καθίζεσθαι ἢ ἂν βουλώμεθα κατακλιθῆναι. Plane-trees also appear as resting points in Theoc. 18.44f., 22.76, Nic. *Ther.* 584 θερειλεχέος πλατάνοιο, Meleag. *HE* 13.8, Anon. *FGE* 73, 74, Thyill. *FGE* 1, Ach. Tat. 1.2.3, see N-H on Hor. *C.* 2.11.13.

The possibility that Bourina and the shady plane-tree belong to the same context is corroborated by Theoc.'s 7.8 εὔσκιον ἄλσος around Bourina and by Philetas' garden in Long. 2.3.5 συνηρεφὴς γὰρ καὶ κατάσκιος καὶ πηγαῖς τρισὶ κατάρρυτος. On Theoc. draw Ov. *Am.* 3.1.5–6 *hic ego dum spatior tectus nemoralibus umbris,/quod mea, quaerebam, Musa moveret opus* and Virg. *E.* 9.40–2 *varios hic flumina circum/fundit humus flores, hic candida populus antro/imminet et lentae texunt umbracula vites* reproducing the same combination. That L. Roß (*Reisen auf den griechischen Inseln des ägäischen Meeres* iii, Stuttgart-Tübingen 1845, 132) saw in the vicinity of Bourina "eine Gruppe mächtiger Platanen" is another one of these striking similarities between ancient and modern flora, as with the trees on the banks of Scamander (Richardson on *Il.* 21.350–1).[76]

---

p. 275f. In Call. fr. 2a.16 'Αγανίππη] and 2a.20 Περμησσο]ῦ appear the Heliconian spring Aganippe and the river Permessus, from whence Aganippe draws its own waters. Aganippe's purity may be pointed out in fr. 2a.25 παρθένο]ς (and fr. 2a.30 'Αονίου]). Then in fr. 2.1 Hippocrene appears. There is some confusion concerning the identity of Aganippe and Hippocrene as the Oxford Scholiast of Call. (fr. 2a.16) seems to imply that they are the same springs. Later, Propertius 2.10.25f. and 3.3.5f. (~ T. 23d) envisages Hippocrene as the spring of heroic verse, Aganippe as the one of erotic elegy, see Massimilla 236–7.

[76] Mrs Athena Tarsouli, *Δωδεκάνησα* iii, Athens 1950, 35–6 toured the area and recorded her own suggestive experience: "Σὲ μιὰ μαγευτικὴ τοποθεσία . . . σὲ μιᾶς

Trees and springs are the two basic constituents of a *locus amoenus*. Bees appearing in fr. 14, an integral component of a *locus amoenus*, may belong to the same context. In the charming Ithacan shore in *Od.* 13.102f. bees appear besides a cavern of Nymphs:

αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος τανύφυλλος ἐλαίη·
ἀγχόθι δ' αὐτῆς ἄντρον ἐπήρατον ἠεροειδές,
ἱρὸν Νυμφάων, αἱ Νηιάδες καλέονται.
ἐν δὲ κρητῆρές τε καὶ ἀμφιφορῆες ἔασι
λάινοι· ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα τιθαιβώσσουσι μέλισσαι·
ἐν δ' ἱστοὶ λίθεοι περιμήκεες, ἔνθα τε Νύμφαι
φάρε' ὑφαίνουσιν ἁλιπόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι·
ἐν δ' ὕδατ' ἀενάοντα.

Next, bees appear in similar sorroundings *and* in connection with Demeter in Theoc. 7.142 and apparently in Call. *HyAp.* 110–2, so that fr. 14 may be assumed to belong to the antecedent passage lurking in Theoc. and Call. In general, bees often appear in idyllic scenery and, since they were allegedly nurtured with water, often in connection with springs or dewy meadows.[77] The bees' presence would suggest the notion of purity, cf. Arist. *HA* 596b15f. ἡ δὲ μέλιττα μόνον πρὸς οὐδὲν προσίζει σαπρόν, οὐδὲ χρῆται τροφῇ οὐδεμιᾷ ἀλλ' ἢ τῇ γλυκὺν ἐχούσῃ χυμόν· καὶ ὕδωρ δ' ἥδιστον εἰς ἑαυτὰς λαμβάνουσιν ὅπου ἂν ἀναπηδᾷ (see Davies-Kathirithamby 58–9). They are an apt choice too: they are in accordance with the scenery, Demeter and Cos (see fr. 14). Their image may have conveyed sacral and poetological connotations.

These features suffice to indicate that the setting around Bourina is modelled on *Od.* 17.205–11:

ὥρας ἀπόσταση ἀπὸ τὴν πολιτεία βρίσκεται ἡ πανάρχαιη καὶ ἱστορικὴ πηγὴ τῆς Βουρίνας, λεγόμενη καὶ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἱπποκράτη [. . .] Τὸ πανοραματικὸ τοπίο ποὺ ξετυλίγεται κάτω ἀπ' τὰ μάτια μας εἶναι ἀρκετὸ γιὰ νὰ μᾶς ξεκουράσει ἀπὸ τὴν κοπιαστικὴ πεζοπορία, ὅπως καὶ τ' ὁλόδροσο νεράκι τῆς πηγῆς νὰ μᾶς δροσίσει τὸν φλογισμένο, ἀπ' τὸ καλοκαιρινὸ λιοπύρι, λάρυγγά μας. [. . .] Ξαπλωμένοι κάτω ἀπὸ τὸν ἴσκιο ἑνὸς ἀπ' αὐτὰ τά, κατὰ τὸ περισσότερο, ἄγρια δέντρα [*sc.* the ones surrounding Bourina] . . . ξεκουραζόμαστε . . . ὅσο ποὺ τὸ ἀλαφροφύσημα τοῦ μεσημεριάτικου μπάτη μᾶς κλείνει τὰ βλέφαρα κάτω ἀπὸ τῆς πνοῆς του τὸ πέρασμα."

[77] Cf. *Od. l.c.*, Simon. *PMG* 593, Eur. *Hipp.* 76–7, Theoc. 1.107, 5.46–7, 22.41–2, A.R. 1.879–82 (in a λειμών/ἑρσήεις) whence Virg. *A.* 6.707–9 (see W. W. Briggs in *ANRW* II.31.2, 970–1), Nicias *HE* 6.1–2, Adesp. Lyr. *CA* 7.12–8, Anon. PVind. Rainer 29801.56 Bernsdorff (pap. saec. p.C. III) φιλόδροσος . . μέλισσα/, Long. 1.9.1, Nonn. *D.* 5.243–6, Virg. *G.* 4.8f. esp. 18–24, 4.139–40 (the old Corycian man breeds bees in his garden), *Ecl.* 1.53–5, Martial 2.46.1–2.

ἄστεος ἐγγὺς ἔσαν καὶ ἐπὶ κρήνην ἀφίκοντο
τυκτὴν καλλίροον, ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται,
τὴν ποίησ' Ἴθακος καὶ Νήριτος ἠδὲ Πολύκτωρ·
ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ αἰγείρων ὑδατοτρεφέων ἦν ἄλσος,
πάντοσε κυκλοτερές, κατὰ δὲ ψυχρὸν ῥέεν ὕδωρ
ὑψόθεν ἐκ πέτρης· βωμὸς δ' ἐφύπερθε τέτυκτο
Νυμφάων, ὅθι πάντες ἐπιρρέζεσκον ὁδῖται.

The Odyssean circumstances are similar to those postulated in P., as Odysseus and Eumaeus walk from an accidental meeting point at a spring towards the palace in the town of Ithace. The spring is similar to Bourina, too: both are created by legendary rulers of the respective islands (for Ithace cf. Σ *Od.* 17.205, II.639 Dindorf), both flow out of a rock and are surrounded by poplars (for Bourina cf. Theoc. 7.8), serving as resting points for the wayfarers. And both are holy and at the service of the community (cf. *HHD* 99 (exhausted Demeter sat) Παρθενίῳ φρέατι ὅθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται).[78] Subsequently, poplars close to a water source, water flowing from a rock and Nymphs recur in Call. and Theoc. in very similar ideal scenery directly associated with Demeter.

In this locale of almost mythical charm, a dialogue between Demeter and Chalcon seems to have taken place at midday. The *HHD*-precedent of Demeter sitting at the Callichoros well to mourn (a motif in the literary treatment of her myth, see fr. 8) indicates that the locale around Bourina and the lamentation-scene belong to the same context. Now it is time for Demeter to give way to her grief. Her bewailing of her misfortunes would sharply contrast to the exuberant beauty of the place. The description of the vegetation might have been static, like the "traurige Fruchtbarkeit" that Goethe saw in Segesta.[79] Demeter's lament is vividly conducted in direct speech and is influenced by the tearful encounter of Achilleus and Priam in *Il.* 24.507f. The final effect, however, is not plangent, but rather amusing. What is superficially a sombre effect is alleviated by comically allusive language: ἄλγεα πέσσω in fr. 13.1 (cf. fr. 9.1) alludes

[78] First Weingarth 92f. noticed the similarities between the Homeric spring and Bourina as described in Theoc. 7.6–7, cf. also U. Ott, *RhM* n.s. 150 (1972), 147–8, N. Crevans, *TAPA* 113 (1983), 208–12, M. Halperin, *Before Pastoral*, New Haven 1983, 224–7, Hunter 1996, 23.

[79] *Italienische Reise*, 20 April 1787; mentioned in P. Philippson, *Griechische Gottheiten in ihren Landschaften*, Oslo 1939, 60.

to Demeter's fasting, ἀέξεται in fr. 9.1, ὡραίων ἐτέων and προσαυξάνεται in fr. 10.2, 4 to the sterility of the land, ἔμπεδ(α) in fr. 10.4 to the current residence of her lost daughter. μελέοιο κορεσσάμενος κλαυθμοῖο in fr. 12.1 may wittily hint at a moderate weeping, enough though to satiate a goddess.

Along with its physical beauty, the Coan scenery exudes a reverent sanctity. The signs are clear. Springs are commonly sacred (Farnell v, 40). Trees, and esp. plane-trees, are very often part of sacred groves, see fr. 8. Bees are equally divine, cf. Arist. *GA* 761a4, Plato *Ion* 534b–c, Xen. *Oec.* 7.32, see Byl 341–2, Davies-Kathirithamby 69. The spring, the rock and the trees are constituent parts of a sanctuary, see Burkert 1985, 84–7. This is, then, as usual in poetry, a *locus amoenus* and a *locus sanctus*, cf. *Od.* 5.57–73 (on which Schönbeck 61–70), *Od.* 13.102f., Sappho fr. 2, see Pearce 301–2.

Demeter seems to visit Cos in spring, the season most often associated with her. ὡραίων ἐτέων in fr. 10.2 suggests such a season, as does the metaphorical language of fr. 9 and the florescent nature of the *locus*, as deduced mainly from Theoc. 7. The search for shade and possible thirst imply harsh sun. Bees normally appear in spring (fr. 14), sheep were shorn in spring (fr. 16) and Zephyrus blows mostly in spring too.[80] Suggestively, Theoc. 7 is placed a little later, at the end of summer (Gow ii, 127, Schönbeck 118–9).

At some point, perhaps in the afternoon, host and hosted walk back to town. Here epic hospitality takes the form of a sight-seeing tour. Attention would be diverted to Coan landscape and its archaeology. Itineraries commonly give the opportunity to an author to fit in stories that would otherwise not bind so well with the main storyline. Σ bT (ex.) *Il.* 22.147–56 (V.300 Erbse), where some topographical details are supplied while Achilleus chases Hector, imply that the poet "may be following his custom elsewhere of filling a space in the story, as for example where a journey is taking place" (Richardson ad loc.). Attention is often drawn to the sorroundings, so that a lot of epichoric tales infringe. Antimachus, in the 6th book of the *Thebaid*, takes advantage of the so-called *Argivorum iter* (frr. 29f.) to include a

[80] For the bees cf. *Il.* 2.89 πέτονται ἐπ' ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν, Eur. *Hipp.* 77, Nicias *HE* 6.1 ἔαρ φαίνουσα μέλισσα, Anon. *HE* 50.1–2, Meleag. *HE* 50.2, Q.S. 6.326, Long. 1.9.1 ἦρος ἦν ἀρχὴ . . . βόμβος ἦν ἤδη μελιττῶν etc. and see Austin on Virg. *A.* 6.707. In winter they busy themselves at home, Arat. 1028–30. For the sheering in spring cf. Ar. *Av.* 714 προβάτων πόκον ἠρινόν. For Zephyrus see p. 286f.

number of such stories. And Eratosthenes' *Erigone* apparently contained a tour around Attica by Icarius with the aim of spreading viticulture. Plenty of Attic details may have crept into that section of the poem. Also comparable is the brief Evander-Aeneias tour in Virg. *A.* 8.307–69, described with superstitious reverence (cf. esp. 348–59) foreshadowing the institution of Zeus' temple in Capitolium.

We lack the means to reconstruct Demeter's Coan itinerary. However, it would seem that the poem focused on the eastern part of the island. The area around Bourina, near the town of Cos, which was established as capital of the island not long before P., is the obvious focus of interest. Interestingly, in the area nowadays known as the Serraglio in the NE of the town of Cos, R. Herzog excavated a small late 6th/early 5th cent. BC sanctuary of Demeter and Core centred on a fountain (Sh-W 53). The four Coan localities (Bourina, Pyxa, Haleis and Oromedon mountain, all in the east) about which the Theocritean Σ have access to authoritative information (probably from Nicanor), conceivably figured in P. too. In a small sanctuary of the 4th cent. BC excavated at Kyparissi, an area between the modern villages of Pyli and Asphendiou (ancient Pyxa), was found an altar which belonged to the Halentioi along with statues of Demeter and Core (Sh-W 28, 312). It would seem that the poem laid emphasis on places where an ancient cult of Demeter existed. An eventual approach to Pyxa may have been the right time to narrate the events of Heracles' advent on the island (fr. 16) which account for the name of that locality. So the central position of this incident implied in Σ Theoc. 7.5–9f would appear to be justified, as it would be placed between the two main scenes, the one at the Coan countryside and that of the feast at the palace. It may be in such a context that Demeter and Chalcon approached the Coan seashore for a cathartic bathe (see pp. 253, 278, 289f.). Theoc. 7 presumably reproduces some of the geography of *Demeter.*

Subsequently, Demeter finds herself in Chalcon's palace. This may happen late in the evening, when Hesperus appears. Demeter perhaps makes an auspicious entrance with the other foot (ἕτερον πόδα) and sees female slaves ending in orderly fashion their daily toils (fr. 17). At Hesperus-time their wool-working is coming to a halt. Hospitality involves the preparation and setting out of select food. A choice of commodities is set out: fish (fr. 18), wine (fr. 19) and perhaps beans and apples — most of them notoriously despised by Demeter. The feast continues with music. Chalcon summons a piper

to entertain his guest and some of the attendants may have danced (see fr. 20). As appropriate to those times, the dinner guests may lie on *stibades*. With the sound of pipes and with the imposing presence of a goddess the ambience is hallowed. The goddess would be so happy with the proceedings, that these established themselves as the official ritual of her cult in Cos. The next thing we know is that in a grandiose distich Demeter announces her intention of visiting Eleusis, which may mean that her departure from Cos is imminent. At the end, the poet might have kept a few lines for poetological declarations in the fashion of Call. *HyAp*.

The preceding discussion establishes the fact that *Demeter* was a narrative elegy. The sequence of events creates the impression that it is designed to reflect the Thesmophoric rites.[81] The slave-maidens carrying baskets filled with wool in fr. 17 suggest an image of procession. The ascent to Bourina would correspond to the *anodos* to Pnyx on the first day of the Attic Thesmophoria (Σ Ar. *Thesm.* 585, Hsch. α 5234). The fasting and lament of Demeter would prescribe the gloomy mood during the second day of the celebration (Νηστεία), cf. Plut. *Dem.* 30.5 τὴν σκυθρωποτάτην τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἡμέραν ἄγουσαι παρὰ τῇ θεῷ νηστεύουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες. Demeter's sitting down on Coan soil, her probable break from fasting in the evening and the reclining on *stibades* would also lay down a prototype ritual. So would the torches, possibly lit during the banquet at Chalcon's palace. The feast-scene may have evoked similarities with the orgiastic aspect of Demeter's cult, cf. fr. 20 (pipes, and dancing?). Certain features of that scene, such as the old-fashioned fawn-tibia (fr. 20), the reclining on *stibades*, the cooking on fire and possibly the unfiltered wine (see pp. 254, 255f.) evoke the primitive way of life prescribed for

[81] In Cos Thesmophoria are not directly attested, but a ritual involving one or more *pannychides* by women in honour of Demeter (cf. *HHD* 292–3) leaves little doubt as to the celebration of the festival. This is evidenced in a late 3rd or early 2nd cent. BC metrical inscription published with commentary by R. Herzog, *PhW* 52 (1932), 1013–17 (cf. also Sh-W 311–2, M. P. J. Dillon, *ZPE* 124 (1999), 76–7). "Der Frauenkult ist etwa wie die Thesmophorien in Athen zu denken", Herzog, *l.l.*, 1015. The inscription is dedicated by Aischron, a married Coan woman, to Demeter Soteira and perhaps to Core and Poseidon. The Coan ladies gather at night (καὶ Κούραν νυχ[ίαις ἱλάσατ' ἐν τελεταῖς], suppl. Herzog) in the sanctuary of Demeter to celebrate the goddess with secret (?, v. 3 ἐν τελεταῖς Δάμα[τρος) rites. Sudden earth-tremors disrupt the process and Aischron, who may be a dignitary of Demeter, exhorts the worshippers to address an entreaty to the goddess, who is said to have brought to a stop all portents.

the celebration of the Thesmophoria (Diod. Sic. 5.4.6 of the Syracusan women μιμούμενοι τὸν ἀρχαῖον βίον). Other details such as the rotten corpse of an ox in fr. 14 may evoke Thesmophoric associations, too. The possible approach to the sea would correspond to the Attic ἅλαδε ἔλασις, a purificatory rite taking place three days before the commencement of the Eleusinian mysteries. The area around Bourina would no doubt be the place where the Coan women celebrated the Thesmophoria.

One last possibility is worth considering. Cos was the most famous and long-lasting medical centre of the ancient world. It was Coan doctors who transplanted their art to Alexandria: Praxagoras, a coeval of P., is said to be the teacher of Herophilus. The *koinon* 'guild' of Coan doctors was powerful in Cos and some of its members are inscriptionally attested as generous donors to public needs. The flow of Coan medics to Alexandria was constant and surely came to have some influence on the Ptolemaic court (Fraser i, 338f., Sh-W 256f., 270–1, Craik 126–8). P. may not have neglected such a long and proud tradition. Internal indications and considerations would support this assumption. Demeter is sometimes given healing capabilities. The seed is sown in *HHD* 228–30 (of Demophon), cf. Call. *HyDem.* 125 ὡς πόδας, ὡς κεφαλὰς παναπηρέας ἕξομες αἰεί, Antiphil. *GPh* 39, Orph. *Hy.* 40.20, Artemid. *Onir.* 2.39, Ov. *F.* 4.529–32. In most cases medical and magical powers appear combined. The cult of Asclepius was apparently not introduced in Cos before 350 BC and the supervision of medical activity might have previously been a responsibility of Demeter.[82]

P. exhibits a not negligible interest in coeval science and the insinuation of medical knowledge is a clear trend in Hellenistic poetry.[83]

---

[82] Even after the introduction of Asclepius' cult from the mainland, the two were associated in Cos no less than in other Asclepius-centres, see Sh-W 334–5 assuming an earlier date for the introduction of Asclepius' cult in Cos (but this lacks any foundation), C. Benedum, "Asklepios und Demeter", *JDAI* 101 (1986), 135–57, Parker 1996, 179–80. In general, see Rubensohn, "Demeter als Heilgottheit", *AM* 20 (1895), 360f., Farnell iii, 367 n. 258, Richardson on *HHD* 228–30 quoting a 4th cent. BC inscription from Phalasarna (Cos) influenced by these lines of the *HHD*.

[83] On A.R. see Fraser i, 634, Zanker 1987, 72–3. On Theoc. see Gow i, xix n. 3. On Call. see H. Oppermann, "Herophilos bei Kallimachos", *Hermes* 60 (1925), 14–32, G. W. Most, *Hermes* 109 (1981), 188–96, Nikitinski 125f. Aratus wrote poems with medical content (*SH* 92–8), see E. Maass, *Aratea*, Leipzig 1892, 223f. For Euphorion cf. *CA* 41, 43, 159. On Nicander, described by Suid. ν 374 as ἅμα γραμματικός τε καὶ ποιητὴς καὶ ἰατρός, see J. M. Jacques, *Ktema* 4 (1979), 133–49, A. Tonwaide, *Aevum* 65 (1991), 65–101, K. Oikonomides, *REG* 112 (1999), 238–52.

Medicine is in its own right well-rooted in epic tradition (cf. esp. *Il.* 4.389–419, 11.844–8). There is evidence of interdisciplinary activity in Cos. Nicias of Miletus, a friend of Theoc., is the best-known physician with literary interests,[84] but he was not the only one. Call. *HE* 3 probably addresses a Coan doctor, Philippus. As in Theoc. 11, the subject is love cured by song. On the other hand, Xenocritus, a Coan grammarian contemporary with P., composed the first ever Hippocratic glossary, and a few years later the Coan doctor, Philinus, was acclaimed as a medical glossographer.

What the occasion might have been for Demeter to exhibit her healing capabilities, is not known. A possibility might be suggested by the postulated appearance of a child in *Demeter* (see p. 263; at a second reading, Theoc. 7.147 reads as if a four year old baby is sweating — of fever?). In *HHD* 228–30 the goddess promises to protect Demophon against any spell or illness and in Ov. *F.* 4.537f. Demeter actually brings back to life Metaneira's dying baby, Triptolemus (538 *iam spes in puero nulla salutis erat*) by kissing it on the lips:[85] *pallor abit, subitasque vident in corpore vires:/tantus caelesti venit ab ore vigor.* Could Theoc. 7.70 (πίομαι) ἐς τρύγα *χεῖλος ἐρείδων* be related here? This is a miraculous method of healing anticipated by Demeter's respiration on Demophon in *HHD* 238 ἡδὺ καταπνείουσα καὶ ἐν κόλποισιν ἔχουσα. The cause of the evil might have been a lizard, such as the one taking its midday rest in Theoc. 7.22 σαῦρος ἐν αἱμασιαῖσι καθεύδει. Demeter is said to have turned Ascalabus into a gecko (i.e. a spotted lizard) while hosted by king Celeus in Nic. *Ther.* 484–5 (ascalabus) τὸν μέν τε ῥέει φάτις οὕνεκ' Ἀχαιὴ/Δημήτηρ ἔβλαψεν ὅθ' ἄψεα σίνατο παιδός, a reptile associated with magic and considered in popular thought as an incarnation of invisible maleficent forces.[86] Ascalabus is linked to Demeter with a bond of hatred, cf.

For different *Iatrika* in Hellenistic times see *SH*, xx and in general see Pfeiffer 1968, 152f., Zanker 1987, 124–7. On poems of medical content of a later date see B. Effe, *Dichtung und Lehre*, Munich 1977, 194–204.

[84] On Nicias see *HE* ii, 428–9, W. Schott, *Arzt und Dichter: Nikias von Miletos*, Munich 1976, A. Lai, *QUCC* n.s. 51 (1995), 125–31.

[85] A rare method of miraculous healing, see C. Sittl, *Die Gebärde der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig 1890, 345f., O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder*, Gießen 1909, 73f., *id.*, *ARW* 32 (1935), 246f., esp. 249f., Bömer on Ov. *F.* 4.540.

[86] See E. Delatte, "Études sur la magie grecque iii", *Musée Belge* 18 (1914), 5–96, A. D. Nock, *Magical Texts from a Bilingual Papyrus*, London 1931, 274–9. Bodson 63f. discusses Praxiteles' statue of infant Apollo *sauroctonos* (Pliny *NH* 34.70). On bees' animosity to lizards see Mynors on Virg. *G.* 4.13.

Nic. fr. 56.3 (Ant. Lib. 24.3) καὶ ὑπὸ θεῶν καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μεμίσηται . . . ὁ δ' ἀποκτείνας κεχαρισμένος γίνεται Δήμητρι. Nic.'s formulation is equivocal and may imply an inversion of roles with Ascalabus being harmed as a child rather than harming one (ἀσκάλαβος first on a Corinthian vase depicting a large lizard, then here, ἀσκαλαβώτης, which looks like a derivative, Ar. *Nub.* 170 where see Dover, and Arist. *HA* 538a27, *al.*). If reptiles were created from the blood of Titans (Hes. Spur. fr. 367 > Nic. *Ther.* 8f. with Gow-Scholfield ad loc.), Cos may have been thought to abound with them, as the island was once inhabited by Giants (Philostr. *Her.* 140) and since, according to a tradition, it was the place where the Gigantomachy took place (*Meropis SH* 903A, see Janko on *Il.* 14.250–61), cf. of neighbouring Rhodes Ὀφιοῦσσα . . . διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὄφεων (Hsch. ο 1967, Steph. Byz. 546.12 s.v. Ῥόδος). Ascalabus' deadly bite (Arist. *HA* 617a27 ἀσκαλαβωτῶν δήγματα θανάσιμα, Nic. *Ther.* 483 καὶ οὐτιδανοῦ περ ἀπεχθέα βρύγματ') may have given Demeter the opportunity for a medico-magical treatment.

With this rudimentary reconstruction it becomes clear that *Demeter* involves Cos as much as it involves Demeter. This has led some to the conclusion that P. wrote a foundation poem on Cos. G. Vitelli, PSI XI (1935), 141 n. 2 adduced as support Call. T. 7a.10, where he proposed to supplement Κῶν]. Such a reading is now known to be impossible and there is no foundation — and no good reason — for postulating such a poem. P. has also been credited with a *Meropis.* In Prop. T. 23b.31 *tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan* a 15th cent. MS gives *Meropem* as an epithet to P. (accepted by Hanslik in his Teubner 1979 ed.) and G. Luck, *MH* 105 (1962), 347 emended it as *Meropen . . . Philitae* postulating a *Meropis* by the Coan. The only surviving poetic fragment actually dealing with a subject of Coan prehistory is a crude extract of a *Meropis* transmitted in a papyrus containing material commonly attributed to Apollod. Περὶ θεῶν (*SH* 903A). An ascription of this piece to P. is highly unlikely. The fact that Apollodorus, familiar with P.'s work, accidently chanced upon this poem in the Alexandrian library (περιεπέσομεν δὲ ποιήμασιν,| ἐφ' ὧν ἦν ἐπιγραφὴ Μεροπίς,| οὐ δηλοῦσα τὸν ποησο[[. . .] ἐδόκει δέ μοι τὰ ποιήμα|[τα] νεωτέρου τινὸς εἶναι) speaks against such an ascription.

What, if any, was P.'s main source? Cos was not short of traditions of gods or heroes landing there. Herodas 2.97–8 attests a landing of Asclepius and the birth of Leto on Cos, the latter being a mis-

understanding effected by the name of her father Κοῖος in Hes. *Theog.* 404. A similar theoxeny of Rhea is attested for Merops, for which he was rewarded with his transformation into a bird, so as to alleviate his sorrow for the loss of his wife, Σ T (ex.) *Il.* 24.293a[1] (V.573 Erbse) Μέροψ ὁ Κῷος ἀπαύστως ἐπένθει τὴν γυναῖκα· ξενίσας δὲ τὴν Ῥέαν μετεβλήθη καὶ συμπάρεστιν ἀεὶ τῷ Διί. Demeter's visit to Cos is only attested in Σ Theoc. 7.5–9f. One would, though, like to think that Demeter's visit and most of the aetia in the poem are longstanding oral and/or written Coan traditions. As Chalcon was the host of Demeter, popular Coan belief might have credited him with advances in the standard of living, institution of fine laws, establishment of agriculture and apiculture. Popular belief likes to attribute progress achieved through long efforts to one legendary figure. Some of the *mirabilia* treated in the poem, such as the creation of Bourina, might be part of the same tradition. Local historians would not fail to record such claims.

In literary terms, the main model of the poem is the *HHD* adapted to Coan standards. As the hymn demonstrates the aetiological connection of the Eleusinian mysteries with their mythological background (see P. Walcot, *G&R* ii 38 (1991), 1–17), so P.'s poem constitutes an *ad totum* and *ad partem* aetium for the cult of Demeter in Cos and the way this is conducted. The archaic model anticipates many features of P.'s poem. The meeting of Celeus' daughters with disguised Demeter in *HHD* 98f. might have lent motifs to Chalcon's encounter with Demeter. Breaking of fast and mimetic efforts to change Demeter's mood were arguably also taken up. Her medicinal/magical capacities insinuated in *HHD* 228–30 and her conceivable healing respiration on Demophon in 238 might have been exploited by the Coan. Attention to Demeter's brilliance, sweet odour and unkempt hair in *HHD* 277–80 was probably also heeded, cf. fr. 11. Demeter's fine πέπλος in 277 may have been transformed into one of the renowned Coan garments. Eleusis itself appears in fr. 21 as the next destination of Demeter. The plane-tree in fr. 8 may be a Coan adaptation of the Eleusinian olive-tree in *HHD* 98f. Both are useful for providing shade against burning heat. And as Demeter sits at Callichoros to mourn, so does she in Cos at Bourina. Her association with wells in the hymn (98f., 272–3) is heeded with the creation of this Coan spring. Demeter's resentment towards wine in *HHD* 206f. may have had to be moderated to accord with Coan standards. The verbal affinities in the existing fragments are

not striking, still cf. fr. 17 λευκὸν . . ἔρι ~ *HHD* 309 κρῖ λευκὸν (cf. also 452), fr. 21 καί κεν . . ./καί κεν taken up from *HHD* 141–4 and in the same fragment Ἐλευσῖνος . . . λόφον pointing to *HHD* 272, and perhaps fr. 10.2 ὡραίων ἐρχομένων ἐτέων ~ *HHD* 265 ὥρῃσιν . . . περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν.

In the section in which Demeter bewails her misfortunes, P. seems to have turned to the celebrated *Il.* 24.507f., the dramatic meeting-scene of Achilleus and Priam, a father afflicted with grief by the loss of his son. Fr. 13.1 ἐκ Διὸς ἄλγεα πέσσειν echoes *Il.* 24.617 θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσειν. The dependence becomes clear in fr. 12 which is modelled on *Il.* 24.513–4 of Achilleus having his fill of weeping. μελέοιο . . κλαυθμοῖο in fr. 12.1 could be suggested by *Il.* 24.524 οὐ γάρ τις πρῆξις πέλεται κρυεροῖο γόοιο. The course of events in the two scenes is similar: in the Iliadic passage the two heroes burst into tears when they are reminded of their lost loved ones and the younger Achilleus tries to console inconsolable Priam.

The erudite poet draws his means of expression on a wider spectrum of sources. The *incipit* of the poem (fr. 5a) seems to vary the beginning of a Pindaric hymn on the same subject. Pindaric images might have recurred at different parts of the poem, esp. in the Bourina-scene. Fr. 9 metaphorically uses language applied to vegetation in *Od.* 7.118–9. As many of the commodities featuring in Alcinous' garden (the host of Odysseus) in *Od.* 7.112f. reappear in Theoc. 7, one may surmise a broader influence of that passage in the articulation of Chalcon's garden, an echo of which may be Philetas' garden in Long. 3.3. γυμνὸν ἄεμμα in fr. 16 echoes Heracles' γυμνὸν τόξον in *Od.* 11.607. Fr. 13.2 is modelled on Adesp. Eleg. *IEG* 21 and the echoes of Archilochus and Hipponax in Theoc. 7 may be reworkings from P. The scene with piping (fr. 20) draws on the same tradition as Eur. *Hel.* 1339f. and Nonn. *D.* 6.1f.

Lastly, Demeter's? journey from Cos to Athens in fr. 21 indicates an affinity with Mestra's similar journey in Hes. *Cat.* fr. 43a.55f. The same passage mentions Heracles' landing on Cos which P. may have treated from his own perspective (fr. 16). The form Χάλκων which, as indicated by Theoc. 7.6, was the one used by P. for Χαλκώδων, first occurs in this passage. Such an influence is made even more probable by the fact that Call. *HyDem.* chose his subject from this same passage about the very same family of Coan nobles, so as to indicate emulation with P.'s *Demeter.*

Demeter never loses its Coan perspective. With the key-role of

Chalcon the poem eventually celebrates Coan nobility no less than Demeter. A number of Coan legendary nobles may have paraded in *Demeter*: Chalcon and Antagoras ἀφ' ὧν οἱ ἐν Κῷ εὐγενεῖς (Σ Theoc. 7.5–9e, 79.4 Wendel < Nikanor?) along with their mother Clytia and their father Eurypylus (Theoc. 7.5 and Σ ad loc.). Σ Theoc. 7.1a (77.8 Wendel) know of a Coan locality Haleis ἀπὸ Ἄλεντός τινος βασιλέως (Weingarth 56 regards this as a "schnellfertige Etymologie") and Σ 7.45–6c (90.25 Wendel) know Oromedon as a ὄρος ἐν Κῷ ἀπὸ Ὠρομέδοντος τοῦ τῆς Κῶ βασιλεύσαντος. Such information may go back to P.'s Coan commentator Nicanor. Demeter is a civic goddess often associated with political power.[87] As Theoc. 7 shows, Coan nobles regarded themselves as closely associated with her.

What were the features that made *Demeter* so special to the great Alexandrian poets? Firstly, learning. References to other Greek places related both to Cos and Demeter, such as fr. 15 with Thessaly, fr. 19 with Phlious and fr. 21 with Athens and Eleusis, indicate injection of broad erudition. Then its aetiological character: the poem accounts for cult-practices in the worship of Demeter allegedly owing their establishment to her proceedings in Cos. The choice of material balances itself on the combination of three parameters: it is related to Cos, also to Demeter and varies a solid epic background. A most striking feature is a choice of motifs and of language which possess an overwhelmingly subversive power. The fundaments of the poem are undermined one by one. The notion of purity is a primary casualty. Demeter is a goddess particularly concerned with purity and the Coans were also very diligent with this issue: fragments of *leges sacrae* published as *HG* 8.a.ii from the Asclepieum (3rd cent. BC *in.*) prescribe the strictest purificatory rules for the priests of Demeter Olympia and Korotrophos.[88] Despite all this, Demeter's

[87] See, above all, Farnell iii, 72–5 with the observation noted in pp. 79–80, that since her temples are found outside the city-limits, she must have initially been apolitical, M. Detienne in *id.* – P. Vernant, *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grecs*, Paris 1979, 197–8, Foley 142–50, Bremmer 18 with 25 n. 37 and cf. *HHD* 149f. listing previous leaders of Eleusis, Call. *HyDem.* 18, 134–5 τάνδε σάω πόλιν ἔν θ' ὁμονοίᾳ/ἔν τ' εὐηπελίᾳ adapting *HH* 13.1 (*To Demeter*).

[88] See on this Coan law R. Herzog, *ARW* 10 (1907), 400–15, *HG*, 20–5, Sh-W 305–6, Parker 1983, 52–3, E. Krob, *REG* 110 (1997), 448–50. On Demeter's purity see Parker 1983, 393, 383f. (Eleusinian mysteries), Burkert 1985, 452 n. 29 with a reference to D. White, *Hagne Thea*, Diss. Princeton 1964. She is ἁγνή in *HHD* 203, 439, Archil. *IEG* 322, Hes. *WD* 265, Moschio *TrGF* 97 F 6.24, *al.* Persephone is also ἁγνή in *Od.* 11.386, *HHD* 337, where see Richardson.

bees, creatures of exemplary purity, are born out of the putrefying corpse of a bull and her fish ὕκης is asexual itself, but is used by contemporary doctors as sexually invigorating. In a similar fashion, Chalcon, the respected Coan benefactor, may have repeatedly become a grotesque figure. The apparently bold treatment which he experiences in *Demeter* would be made easier by the fact that, unlike other legendary rulers such as Merops or Chalciope, he is exempted from any religious association by later Coans. Then a careful reading reveals that Demeter's pain is expressed in such a way as to suggest a ludicrous whimpering. Her fasting is subjected to verbal ironies such as fr. 13.1 ἄλγεα πέσσειν, and it might have been undermined by trying some Coan poppy-seeds. The reverent goddess is reduced to an ordinary Coan matron, perhaps wearing a fine Coan πέπλος.

The sterility-of-the-land motif suffers severe blows. At a superficial level Cos is submitted to the same punishment, as all other places. But Cos, generally speaking a fertile island (Call. *HyDel.* 164, Strabo 14.2.19, *HG* 1A = *LSCG* 151A of the 4th cent. BC), in 3rd cent. BC was short of grain (see fr. 15) and wheat (cf. Herodas 2.17), which were imported from elsewhere (Sh-W 228 n. 38). Demeter is predominantly a deity of corn and cereals, but the poem does not seem to refer to them at all. Cos, instead, was rich in alternative ways of nourishment, such as fish or honey. Commodities such as hyces, wine (for which its association with Dionysus is pointed out), beans or apples (the last two reprobated by Archestr. *SH* 192.13–4 as being in a symposium τραγήματα . . ./πτωχείης παράδειγμα κακῆς) are not only beyond the realm of Demeter, but also resented by her and her initiates. It is on such products that the poem lays emphasis. This kind of superficial devotion and exquisite, allusive refutation may have permeated the whole poem.

Another feature of *Demeter* is the absorption of contemporary science. Fr. 18 ὕκης . . ἔσχατος harbours the Aristotelian assertion that erythrinos lives in the lower part of the sea. The paradox of bugony presupposes Aristotle's and others' wonder over the procreation of bees. His conscious appeal to science is made clear by the employment of κλῆθρη in fr. 25.2. Such an orientation appears in the vocabulary as well. ἄστλιγγας in fr. 11 is a typical example. Picked up from Theophrastus as ὄστλιγγας, it is introduced into poetry, whence Call., A.R. and Nic. take it up. Fr. 10.4 προσαυξάνεται is also picked up from Theophrastus. A similar process can be suspected of Theoc.

7.68 κνύζα from Theophrastus' κόνυζα and of *id.* 7.147 τετράενος.[89]

When contemporary science fails to give an answer, P.'s art is open to popular belief. Herzog 170 wrote that the Coans were ἄνθρωποι δεισιδαιμονέστατοι and P.'s poem may have been full of omens and superstitions, such as the unpricked fawn in fr. 20, Chalcon's possible apotropaic jangling of the knocker at the front-door of the Coan palace and Demeter's conceivable entrance with the right foot (see p. 275f.). Besides, *Demeter* admits paradoxographic beliefs in frr. 14 and 18, cf. also the miraculous appearance of Bourina. Then an insinuation of magical practices by Coan women of the 'Thessalian' era is attested in fr. 15. The presence of such features in *Demeter* may be suggested by the reference to lizards in Theoc. 7.22 (see Gow on 2.58) and possibly by the threats to Pan in 7.103f. (see M. Fantuzzi – F. Montanari, *ZPE* 114 (1997), 27–9) and the γραία . . ./. . ἐπιφθύζοισα in 7.126–7. The apotropaic character of the Thesmophoric habit of aeschrology (Deubner 57–8, Burkert 1985, 244, cf. Call. fr. 21.9–10) might have played a role here. P.'s interest in the subject is secured by the power of Hippomenes' apples in fr. 27.

Demeter is pioneering in other respects too. After Antimachus, it leads experimentation with elegiac distich as a vehicle for narrative aiming to supplant hexameter (see Bulloch 31–8; Simonides early enough recounted the battle of Plataea in elegiacs, *IEG* 10f.). The poem also contained glosses, a particular interest of P.: ὄμπνια?, ἄεμμα, θρήσασθαι, ἄστλιγγας, most of which were never before used in poetry. Novel and exquisite vocabulary appears: δμωίδες, μελαμπέτροιο, νεῶρες, δολιχαόρου. This substantially reduces the mechanical combination of two Homeric phrases to create a novel one, a technique heavily used in *Hermes*. A lot of phrases are ambiguous or allusive, such as fr. 7 νήχυτον ὕδωρ, fr. 10.4 ἔμπεδ', fr. 12.1 μελέοιο . . κλαυθμοῖο, fr. 21.1 'Αθηναίης δολιχαόρου; others are bold, such as fr. 8 πλατάνῳ γραίῃ ὕπο, fr. 13.1 ἄλγεα πέσσειν, fr. 20.1 γηρύσαιτο νεβρός. In fr. 10.4 low prosaic and elevated poetic diction are juxtaposed (a feature in Asclepiades too). Fr. 9 employs highly descriptive language.

---

[89] On the wide range of verbal rarities in Theophr.'s botanical works see R. Strömberg, *Theophrastus. Studien zur botanischen Begriffsbildung*, Göteborg 1937, 161–76. Theoc.'s debt to Theophrastean scholarship in poems 1, 2, 13 is discussed by S. Amigues, *REG* 109 (1996), 467–88.

III. *Influence of* Demeter

IIIa. *Theocritus 7*

Demeter's influence on, above all, Theoc. and Call. is of fundamental importance for Hellenistic poetry as we seem to face a systematic employment of images which occurred in P. to symbols of the new poetic creed. A.R. might have reacted poignantly to this trend. Theoc. 7 used to be read on the basis of the 'mascarade bucolique' theory, according to which Theoc. was a member of a semi-religious confraternity of 'bucolic' literates, of which P. was the leader. These, allegedly dressed in shepherds' garb, used poetic pen-names and held contests in the countryside.[90] The confusion concerning the interpretation of Theoc. 7 largely results from the multiple, obscure interplay with a literary tradition which is lost to us. Lawall 120–3 argued that the poem concluded an initial so-called 'Coan collection' comprising poems 1–7, traces of which he detected in poem 7. He therefore placed it "on the eve of his departure from Cos". Poem 7 may in fact retrospectively recapitulate Theoc.'s way to artistic perfection. It will be shown not to be introvert, but to incorporate external sources of inspiration. The introduction and the sequestered scenery when Theoc. reached his destination in the poem suggest that he is now an accomplished poet. The idyll may have been composed in Alexandria at a later stage. Among other names of real persons, in 39–41 those of P. and Asclepiades appear with great respect. Boucher 218, Bowie 79–80 and M. Fantuzzi in Cambiano 154 suggested that the whole poem is a γέρας to P., while Hunter 1999, 149 noted that "the poem . . on any interpretation is likely to be full of echoes of Philitas". A closer look might reveal more.

The introductory ἦς χρόνος ἀνίκ(α) refers to a distant time in which objective factors in the poem may now have a different status, but one that still has sentimental value for the narrator.[91] In

---

[90] This fancy is at least as old as F. L. C. Graf Fink von Finkenstein, *Arethusa und die bukolischen Dichter des Altertums* i, rev. ed. 1806 (1st ed. 1789), 140 (see Weingarth 15f.) and gained momentum when Reitzenstein 1893, 226 espoused it, cf. then B. A. van Groningen, *Mnemosyne* iv 12 (1959), 45–8, M. C. Mittelstadt, *RhM* n.s. 113 (1970), 211–27, S. Walker, *Theocritos*, Boston 1980, 20; *contra*: e.g. Herzog 209, Wil. 1924 ii, 138, A. S. F. Gow, *CQ* 34 (1940), 47–51, Arnott 1984, 338–9.

[91] On the interpretation of the introductory line see Gow, Dover, Hunter ad loc., Wil. 1924 ii, 142 with n. 1, A. S. F. Gow, *CQ* 34 (1940), 52–3, Weingarth 79f., T. Choitz – J. Latacz, *WJA* 7 (1981), 86–7.

3–4 τᾷ Δηοῖ γὰρ ἔτευχε θαλύσια καὶ Φρασίδαμος/κἀντιγένης two Coan nobles are said to celebrate a festival of Demeter. These are said to derive their origin from Chalcon and his mother Clytia, so they are descendants of the family which played a leading part as hosts of Demeter in P.'s poem. This introductory statement also serves to connect the beginning and the end of the poem, where Theoc. claims to have celebrated 'Demeter' with his poem. τᾷ Δηοῖ may be the first sign of Philitan intrusion. The term occurs only here in Theoc., who elsewhere uses Δημήτηρ 3x (7.32, 135, 10.42), but it constantly appears in passages with Philitan overtones. In the same line ἔτευχε θαλύσια is a striking phrase. θαλύσια, which gave the poem its title in the MSS, is a Homeric hapax (*Il.* 9.534 of harvest-offerings to the gods) used only here by Theoc. As suspected by Kuchenmüller 21 n. 7 (cf. also Boucher 218–9), P. might have been the first to apply it to Demeter. Theoc. 7.31 creates the adj. θαλυσιάς, whence Nonn. takes it up for Demeter, see Vian on *D.* 2.92, Livrea on Pampr. 3.149, where an agricultural worker sings θαλύσιον ὕμνον. τεύχω in the sense 'prepare' occurs only here in Theoc. The phrase may specifically refer to the banquet (θαλύσια) which Chalcon prepared to honour Demeter, as his descendants do in Theoc. The religious tinge of the term would be appropriate to describe that banquet.

Vv. 4–5 εἴ τί περ ἐσθλόν/χαῶν τῶν ἐπάνωθεν is a Theocritean expression (cf. 2.34 and *HE* 15.4), but the Doric gloss χαός or χάιος, usually glossed as ἀγαθός, may be Philitan. Σ ad loc. (78.13 Wendel) note χαὰ γὰρ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις τὰ ἀγαθά hinting at the employment of this term in Ar. *Lys.* 91, 1157 in this sense. P., who seems to have amply drawn on comedy in *At. Gl.*, may have picked up this gloss from Aristophanes. His attention might have been drawn on it due to a disputed Homeric hapax applying to Dorians, *Od.* 19.177 Δωριέες . . τριχάικες 'very noble' (see Jacoby on Apollod. Ath. *FGrH* 244 F 182, Windekens s.v.). Σ Aesch. *Eum.* 859 (I.81.12 Smith) explain (incorrectly, see Friis Johansen – Whittle ad loc.) βαθυχαῖος as ἡ μεγάλως εὐγενής. The term would be suitable for the Dorian ancestors of the Coan nobles. Alex. Aet. *CA* 7.1 (Eur.) Ἀναξαγόρου τρόφιμος χᾳοῦ may depend on P.[92] On the similar ἐσθλόν see p. 277f.

[92] Restored by Valckenaer (τρόφιμος ἀρχαίου codd.). P.'s use would make its dialectal colour dimmer. His precedence would answer Ll-J's objection (*Studi Gigante*, 372): "the word is Doric . . . and since it is Doric, why should it be introduced by emendation?". Ll-J approves of Bergk's τρόφις ἀρχαίου and would attribute Alex.

Vv. 5–6 ἀπὸ Κλυτίας τε καὶ αὐτῶ/Χάλκωνος, Βούριναν ὃς ἐκ ποδὸς ἄνυε κράναν mention Clytia, who as daughter of Merops, wife of Eurypylus and mother of Chalcon and Antagoras, perhaps figured in *Demeter*. Weingarth 85f. postulated for her a role in P. corresponding to Metaneira's in the *HHD*. Χάλκων is the abbreviated, affectionate form of Χαλκώδων, the latter occurring in [Apollod.] 2.7.1 (see von Kamptz 10–3 and in general Bornmann on Call. *HyArt.* 239). The form is evidently in line with Hes. fr. 43a.60 (Eurypylus) τοῦ δ' υἱεῖς Χάλκων τε καὶ Ἀνταγόρης ἐγένο[ντο. Chalcon is singled out here and Σ Theoc. 7.5–9g (79.16 Wendel) Χάλκωνα τὸν τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Κῴων διαδεξάμενον say that he succeeded Eurypylus to the throne, apparently as his older son, whence his central role in P. with regard to his brother's Antagoras can be inferred. κράναν occurs only here as a clausula in Theoc. (10x).

The reference to the creation of Bourina is followed by a short description of its surroundings. The puzzling proceedings of Chalcon would not be so puzzling to those who had read P.'s more detailed description. Σ ad loc. quote fr. 6 from *Demeter*, which suggests dependence. In 8 in the vicinity of Bourina αἴγειροι πτελέαι τε εὔσκιον ἄλσος ὕφαινον. αἴγειροι πτελέαι τε, reappearing in 136, make up a striking combination. As Puelma first noticed,[93] the phrase is unHomeric and unique in Hellenistic poetry, in a way paralleled only in Call. *HyDem.* 27 ἐν μεγάλαι πτελέαι ἔσαν and 37 ἧς δέ τις αἴγειρος, μέγα δένδρεον αἰθέρι κῦρον in the description of Demeter's grove. Both αἴγειρος and πτελέα occur in damp places.[94] With the sole exception of Eur. *Hipp.* 210, αἴγειρος disappears after Homer until it is rediscovered by the Hellenistic poets. πτελέα (3x *Il.*), is rare in Hellenistic poetry, Call. *HyDem.* 27, *HyArt.* 120, A.R. 4.1427 (*locus amoenus*), Theoc. 1.21, 7.8 = 136, 27.12 as a tree providing ample shade, Nic. *Alex.* 109. It is absent in bucolic other than Theoc. Originally, the novel expression may be a recollection of Theophr. *HP* 3.4.2, 3.6.1 where the two trees are mentioned in one breath. Their common association with death and their sterility may also be suggestive.

Aet. *CA* 7 to Aristophanes (*olim* fr. 676b Kock). The diction of the fragment renders such an ascription unlikely.

[93] Puelma 1960, 162 n. 58, cf. then McKay 1962, 77–8, Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 28, Bowie 79 n. 53.

[94] Poplars: Theophr. *HP* 4.1.1, *Il.* 4.382–3, *Od.* 9.140–1, Eur. *Hipp.* 208f., Mnasalc. *HE* 15.3 with Seelbach 28, Virg. *G.* 4.186, 482f., Gow on Theoc. 7.8. Elms: Theophr. *HP* 3.1.1, *Il.* 21.242, 350, Theoc. 1.21.

Bourina's shady environment may be paralleled with the garden of Philetas in Long. 2.3.5, which is described as an εὔσκιον ἄλσος with running water: συνηρεφὴς γὰρ καὶ κατάσκιος καὶ πηγαῖς τρισὶ κατάρρυτος· ἂν περιέλῃ τις τὴν αἱμασιάν, ἄλσος ὁρᾶν οἰήσεται. Cf. also that in *Am.* 3.1.5 (a passage very much in the Philitan tradition) Ovid meets Elegy *tectus nemoralibus umbris* in a grove with a *fons sacer in medio.*

ὕφαινον in such a usage would find, for some ancient scholars, a parallel in the disputed *Il.* 3.212 μύθους καὶ μήδεα . . ὕφαινον (: ἔφαινον *v.l.*, cf. Call. fr. 26.5 and see West, ed. *Il.* ad loc.), 7.324 (Nestor) ὑφαίνειν ἤρχετο μῆτιν. The verb alludes to the fine texture of the Coan garments possibly suggesting the notion of 'weaving' poetry (S. Goldhill, *PCPS* 32 (1986), 37). It also appears in Call. *HyAp.* 57 θεμείλια Φοῖβος ὑφαίνει in a passage in which Wimmel 1960, 67f. detected the same poetological notion. This may well hark back to P., as Call. T. 6 seems to have employed this imagery to praise *Demeter*, cf. then Prop. T. 23a and from Theoc. Virg. *E.* 9.42 *lentae texunt umbracula vites.* Its conceivable context will be discussed in 136–7 with reference to the Ithacan cave in *Od.* 13.108, where Nymphs φάρε' ὑφαίνουσιν ἁλιπόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι. In 33 εὐπέπλῳ Δαμάτερι appears a truly Coan Demeter wearing a fine garment, as she probably did in *Demeter.* This is a feature suitable for both Demeter and Cos.

V. 9 (poplars and elms) χλωροῖσιν πετάλοισι κατηρεφέες κομόωσαι finds a parallel in A.R. 3.928 (ἐγγύθι νηοῦ)/αἴγειρος φύλλοισιν ἀπειρεσίοις κομόωσα in the description of the first trysting field of Jason and Medea, cf. also Nic. fr. 74.24 χλωροῖς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐπηρεφέες πετάλοισιν. *Ilias Parva EGF* 6.2 χρυσείοις φύλλοισιν †ἀγανοῖσι κομόωσαν provides a parallel, but Theoc. may allude to a certain Philitan verse by conflating diction from different sources. Long. 2.3.5 employs συνηρεφὴς (. . καὶ κατάσκιος) of Philetas' garden, cf. then Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13.4 πέτρα τις ἦν συνηρεφὴς κατὰ κορυφὴν δάφναις καὶ πλατανίστοις [. . .] ἀπὸ δὲ αὐτῆς ὕδωρ ἀκήρατον ἐστάλαττεν.

In his reference to Bourina Theoc. takes issue with P. in more than one respect. He does not only epitomise a haunting scene of *Demeter*, but also seems to reproduce Philitan diction, circumstances and goals. As probably Chalcon and Demeter, so Theoc. and his friends walk in the midday-sun, 7.21 τὺ (: τὸ *v.l.*) μεσαμέριον πόδας ἕλκεις. Bourina and its shady surroundings, the only real place described, though it is not one of the landmarks of Theoc.'s itinerary,

provides a refreshing contrast to the Coan heat. It also contributes to — and foreshadows — the divine atmosphere to be further developed at the end of the poem. The hallowed ambience may have been a prominent feature of *Demeter*. The two localities constitute the narrative frame of poem 7. The preliminary reference to Bourina foreshadows the water-image of poetry re-emerging at the end of the poem. This will be argued to hark back to P. too.

A link between Bourina and Hesiodic Hippocrene, the ultimate source of all poetic initiations, is commonly advocated.[95] Since P.'s verses were interpreted as conveying a poetical symbolism, an association between the two could be established early enough. This could be due to the conceivable adaptation of features from *Demeter* in a *βουκολικόν* context in Theoc. 7, where *Bou*rina comes up just before Simichidas' meeting with a poetic creature such as was Lycidas. With regard to Call., there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Hesiod was represented as drinking water from Hippocrene on Helicon, cf. esp. Alc. Mess. *HE* 12.6, Asclep. (or Archias) *HE* 45.5–7, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 3.1–2 and see Massimilla 235. Call. specified the locale of Hesiod's encounter with the Muses as beside Hippocrene, fr. 2.1 ποιμ̣ένι μῆλα νέμ̣οντι παρ' ἴχνιον ὀξέος ἵππου, whereas *Theog.* 23 places this simply Ἑλικῶνος ὑπὸ ζαθέοιο (see Kambylis 66–8). The area of Bourina as the meeting point of Chalcon with Demeter, the creation of that spring with a kick of Chalcon's foot and the drinking from its waters may have had here a decisive effect. Propertius' 'Philitan water' (Tt. 23c.6, 23d.52) may glance at information on this passage. The appeal to Hippocrene might have been implied already in the symbolic context of P.

For Brasilas in 10–1 οὐδὲ τὸ σᾶμα/ἁμῖν τὸ Βρασίλα κατεφαίνετο Hunter ad loc. assumed that he may be a legendary figure from the poetry of P., but whatever information was contained in the Σ is now lost in favour of the Spartan general Brasidas. If Servius is right that Bianor in Virgil's imitation (*E.* 9.59–60 *hinc adeo media est nobis via; namque sepulcrum/incipit apparere Bianoris*) is Ocnus, the legendary founder of Mantua, that may give a clue about Brasilas too. Brasilas' name is elsewhere unattested and, if from P., the Coan's form need not have been identical. A tomb or monument could serve as a point of orientation.

---

[95] See e.g. Lawall 78, 106, N. Krevans, *TAPA* 113 (1983), 208–12 and Hunter 1996, 24.

Lycidas' description in his encounter with Simichidas in 11f. has been argued to bear unmistakable vestiges of Demeter's description in her encounter with Chalcon. The meeting of the two directly after a reference to Bourina may again reproduce features of the meeting of Chalcon and Demeter. The Theoc.-scene recalls the encounter of disguised Odysseus and Eumaeus in *Od.* 17.212–3 ἔνθα σφέας ἐκίχανεν . . . Μελανθεύς/αἶγας ἄγων straight after a reference to an Ithacan spring and its surroundings, which probably served as the model of P.'s description of the locality around Bourina. This seems to be an application of a Philitan motif with reference to its prototype passage.

In 18–9 Lycidas ῥοικὰν δ' ἔχεν ἀγριελαίω/δεξιτερᾷ κορύναν. Later Lycidas donates his stick to Simichidas as a gift from the Muses, 129 ἐκ Μοισᾶν ξεινήιον ὤπασεν ἦμεν. The stick is a symbol of poetry as well as of regal authority (West on Hes. *Theog.* 30). Philitan derivation of this detail is suggested by Prop. T. 23d, where Apollo may portray traits of Demeter's course of action via Call. *Aetia*-prologues. Phoebus addresses Prop. from a Castalian grove while leaning on his golden lyre, T. 23d.13–4 *cum me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus/sic ait aurata nixus ad antra lyra* with which he later shows him the way to the Muses' cave through a narrow path, 25–6 *plectro sedem mihi monstrat eburno,/quo nova muscoso semita facta solo est.* This may have been a notable feature in the presentation of Demeter, as it is the stance assumed by Philetas when he addresses Eros in their encounter in Long. 2.4.3 καμὼν οὖν ὡς γέρων καὶ ἐπερεισάμενος τῇ βακτηρίᾳ . . . ἐπυνθανόμην τίνος ἐστὶ τῶν γειτόνων. The possibility is also supported by Elegy's holding a *virga* of myrtle in her right hand, when she addresses Ovid in the sacred grove in *Am.* 3.1.34 *fallor, an in dextra myrtea virga fuit?*, then cf., perhaps, Virg. *E.* 8.16 *incumbens tereti Damon sic coepit olivae* and an echo of Theoc. in Anon. *AP* 16.265.9 (Momos) σεσηρὼς βάκτρον ἀποστηρίζεται ἐς γᾶν. For Theoc.'s wild olive-branch cf. that an olive-tree appears at *HHD* 100 at the meeting scene of Demeter with Celeus' daughters, but beware of Theoc.'s misplacements. Ovid's myrtle seems likelier, cf. Long. 2.4.1 (Philetas encounters Eros) ὑπὸ ταῖς ῥοιαῖς καὶ ταῖς μυρρίναις βλέπεται παῖς, μύρτα καὶ ῥοιὰς ἔχων, 2.4.4 ἔβαλλέ με τοῖς μύρτοις, and Demeter's association with myrtle, see P. G. Maxwell-Stuart, "Myrtle and the Eleusinian Mysteries", *WSt* 85 (1972), 145–61, E. Voutiras, *Chiron* 29 (1999), 244 n. 47.

In 19–20 Lycidas addresses Simichidas with a sweet smile and the

sparkling eyes characteristic of a god's serene reception of her/his protégé (cf. *Od.* 13.287, Sappho fr. 1.13–5), καί μ' ἀτρέμας εἶπε σεσαρώς/ὄμματι μειδιόωντι, γέλως δέ οἱ εἴχετο χείλευς. Cf. the Muses in their encounter with Archilochus, *SEG* 15.517.30–2 (Paros, 3rd cent. BC) τὰς δέ/δέξασθαι αὐτὸν μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ γέλωτος καί/[ἐ]περωτῆσαι etc. In 42 (Lycidas) ἁδὺ γελάσσας expresses, as in Homer, the *Schadenfreude*, the sarcastic laugh at someone's pains (or misfortune), see Cameron 1995, 412–3. It would appear that at the meeting scene, as Demeter saw Chalcon's painful walk under the glare of a hot sun, she welcomed him with a smile, immediately looked on him favourably and addressed him with friendly mockery, typical of the Muses' address to their audience, cf. Hes. *Theog.* 26. Long. 2.4.4 applies this motif to Eros at his meeting with herdsman Philetas, ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο μὲν οὐδέν, στὰς δὲ πλησίον ἐγέλα πάνυ ἁπαλὸν . . . καὶ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἔθελγε μηκέτι θυμοῦσθαι, 2.5.1 ἔνθα πάνυ καπυρὸν γελάσας etc. In Ov. *Am.* 3.1.33 Elegy addresses the poet in a similar temper, *limis subrisit ocellis.* Demeter's favourable look at Chalcon may cast fresh light on the way the Muses look at young poets in Call. fr. 1.37–8 Μοῦσαι γ⌊ὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄθμα⌊τι⌋ παῖδας/μὴ λοξῷ πολιοὺς⌋ οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους.[96] The good/evil eye would be appropriate as another superstition of P.

In 21 (Lycidas to Simichidas) μεσαμέριον πόδας ἕλκεις is an expression commonly used of "slow and painful walking" (Gow ad loc.), cf. already 1–2 εἰς τὸν Ἄλεντα/εἵρπομες ['walked', an esp. Doric/Argolic feature, see Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 3] ἐκ πόλιος, and Lycidas in 130–1 τὰν ἐπὶ Πύξας/εἷρφ' ὁδόν. The slow tiresome gait, the midday sun and the earlier reference to Bourina and its shady surroundings indicate that Chalcon and his escorts were walking in harsh sun when Demeter took notice of them. Midday is the usual time for epiphanies and its burning heat is often pointed out in such contexts, cf. *Od.* 4.400, Alc. fr. 307c, A.R. 4.1312–13 ἔνδιον ἦμαρ ἔην, περὶ δ' ὀξύταται θέρον αὐγαί/ἠελίου, Call. *HyPal.* 73. The possibility that Demeter and Chalcon met at midday is corroborated, other than the Theocritean passages, with Philetas meeting Eros in his garden ἀμφὶ μέσην ἡμέραν in Long. 2.4.1, by the probable appear-

---

[96] Call. may have used this motif in Hesiod's encounter with the Muses as well, as Archias may indicate, *apud* Asclep. *HE* 45.1–2 αὐταὶ ποιμαίνοντα μεσημβρινὰ μῆλά σε Μοῦσαι/ἔδρακον ['looked on with favour', see G-P ad loc.] ἐν κραναοῖς οὔρεσιν, Ἡσίοδε.

ance of the Philitan Nymphs at noon time, cf. Call. *HyDem.* 38 (near a poplar) ταὶ νύμφαι ποτὶ τῶνδιον ἑψιόωντο, as well as by the fact that Call. may have specified the time of Hesiod's encounter with the Muses on Helicon (*Aet.* fr. 2) as midday, as Archias may suggest, *apud* Asclep. *HE* 45.1 ποιμαίνοντα μεσημβρινὰ μῆλα.

In 22 a lizard, possibly once active in P. (see p. 237f.), is now said to be taking a midday siesta ἐν αἱμασιαῖσι. Philitan provenance can be assumed for the ἐπιτυμβίδιοι κορυδαλλίδες in 23, which resurface in 141 as singing κόρυδοι. These are inconspicuous birds associated with chthonic Demeter, see A. Lezzi-Hafter, "Demeter mit dem Vogelszepter" in E. Böhr – W. Martini (edd.), *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei. Festschrift für K. Schauenburg*, Mainz 1986, 87–9 identifying the bird on top of Demeter's sceptre in a 5th cent. BC Boeotian plate (no VIII.B in Gow ii) as a lark. The singing of a lark might have heralded a symbolic early-morning waking, cf. Theoc. 10.50 ἄρχεσθαι δ' ἀμῶντας ἐγειρομένω κορυδαλλῶ with Σ (K) 48–51e (237.24 Wendel) ὁ γὰρ κορυδαλλὸς περὶ τὸ λυκόφως ἐξέρχεται εἰς τὰς νομάς. Hellenistic poetry later (e.g. Call. *Hec.* frr. 70f. A.R. 3.929f.) fancies talking birds. The possibility that what was alive and active in P. is now said to be at rest speaks for this poem being a posthumous consecration to P.

Lycidas' teasing includes a question full of poetological connotations, 24–5 ἦ μετὰ δαῖτ' ἄκλητος ἐπείγεαι, ἤ τινος ἀστῶν/λανὸν ἔπι θρῴσκεις. Parasites traditionally hurry uninvited (τρεχέδειπνος, see Hunter ad loc.) and the allusion may be to the plunder of Homer's poetry by cyclic poets in the spirit of Pollianus *AP* 11.130.2 λωποδύτας ἀλλοτρίων ἐπέων, 7 τὸν Ὅμηρον ἀναιδῶς λωποδυτοῦσιν. For the literary background cf. the Muses' abuse in Hes. *Theog.* 26 ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι . . . γαστέρες οἶον, next the poetological food-metaphors in Call. *HyDem.* 87f. The violent raid upon the wine-jar (λανὸν ἔπι θρῴσκεις) anticipates *in oppositione* the Nymphs' poetic, gentle mixing of wine in 154. The question is echoed in Philetas' address to Eros in their encounter in Long. 2.4.3 ἐπυνθανόμην τίνος ἐστὶ τῶν γειτόνων, καὶ τί βουλόμενος ἀλλότριον κῆπον τρυγᾷ, then in Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13.2 Νικίας δ' ὁ λάσταυρος . . . 'ποῦ' φησιν ἡμῖν 'ἀθρόαι; τίνος ἄπιτε ἐκπιεῖν ἀγρόν;'.

Vv. 25–6 ὥς τοι ποσὶ νισσομένοιο/πᾶσα λίθος πταίοισα ποτ' ἀρβυλίδεσσιν ἀείδει might harbour a reference to the miraculous effect of Demeter's brisk walk on the stones. Σ 7.26a (86.23 Wendel) explain the marvel ἴσως διὰ τὴν εὐμουσίαν τοῦ Θεοκρίτου. This would adapt

the unmusical epiphanic tremor of the earth under a god's feet as he takes superhuman strides (*Il.* 13.18, 14.285, A.R. 2.679–80). Such an adaptation would carry symbolic weight, conforming with Call. fr. 1.19–20 μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶ⌋ṭε μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδήν/τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶ⌋ν οὐκ ἐμόν, ⌊ἀλλὰ⌋ Διός. With regard to the motif, note that the identity of Iris, disguised as a mortal woman, in Virg. *A.* 5.649 is revealed by her *grassus*. The *HHD* 171f. pays particular attention to the velocity of Celeus' daughters (Richardson on v. 171), Demeter walks there ῥαδινοῖσι . . . ποσσίν (a Homeric hapax, which some understood as εὐκίνητον, Σ D on *Il.* 23.583), and they and Demeter are said to reach Celeus' palace swiftly, 184 αἶψα δὲ δῶμαθ' ἵκοντο διοτρεφέος Κελεοῖο. ἀρβυλίδες usually appear on the feet of travellers and they could be mentioned in P. as an old-fashioned type of footwear worn by Chalcon.

P. is mentioned by name in 40. In Lycidas' song, motifs and probably technical vocabulary from him seem to make an abundant appearance in an altered context. In 61 Ἀγεάνακτι πλόον διζημένῳ ἐς Μιτυλήναν Ageanax is said to have embarked on a journey to Lesbos. Mytilene is linked with Cos through their common Thessalian pedigree. Diod. Sic. 5.81 (Macareus, king of Lesbos) τὴν Κῶ κατοικίσας ἀπέδειξεν αὐτῆς βασιλέα Νέανδρον knows of Lesbian colonists of Thessalian origin who settled Cos (and Rhodes and Samos), for which passage Wil. 1886, 53 n. 23 surmised a Rhodian source. Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* features the aged herdsman Philetas in Lesbos.

Most importantly, Lycidas' experiences concerning his departed beloved Ἀγεάναξ are likely to be modelled on those of Demeter's during Chalcon's feast at the Coan palace. Lycidas drinks wine, cooks beans on the fire and has a garland on his head. His pain is soothed by listening to pipes in a feast held for him, 71 αὐλησεῦντι δέ *μοι* (cf. fr. 20), during which he reclines on a *stibas* of Thesmophoric plants and listens to stories about the arch-founders of the bucolic song in a solidly Sicilian context. These stories have a distinct consolatory function: "the story of Daphnis assures the hearer that others have suffered more than he, and the story of Komatas is of triumph over adversity" (Hunter 1999, 173). Daphnis' troubles are presented in a way alluding to Persephone: he is shut up alive in an εὐρέα λάρναξ and suffers in 79 κακαῖσιν ἀτασθαλίαισιν ἄνακτος (cf. fr. 13.1 ἐκ Διὸς ἄλγεα πέσσειν), but bees are at his service and with honey-combs he survives a whole spring (85 ἔτος ὥριον). In *Demeter* honey (fr. 14) might have similarly served as food in the lean

times during Demeter's fast, cf. Virg. *E.* 9.30. In this story, Σ 7.78/9a and 7.83 (99.6 and 101.7 Wendel) say that Theoc. τὰ τοῦ Δάφνιδος εἰς τὸν Κομάταν <μετήνεγκεν>.

Lycidas' wishes regarding Comatas in 86f. αἴθ' ἐπ' ἐμεῦ ζωοῖς ἐναρίθμιος ὤφελες ἦμεν etc. would befit Demeter's wishes for Persephone. In the exotic 76–7 εὖτε χιὼν ὥς τις κατετάκετο μακρὸν ὑφ' Αἷμον/ἢ Ἄθω ἢ Ῥοδόπαν ἢ Καύκασον ἐσχατόωντα Daphnis is said to melt like snow due to his anguish over (vanished?, see Dover 84) Xenea. That same image crops up in Call. *HyDem.* 91–2 ὡς δὲ Μίμαντι χιὼν . . ./. . . ἔτι μέζον ἐτάκετο of Demeter's victim Erysichthon. If from P., the image could be employed of Demeter's weeping (fr. 12), as in the prototype passage, *Od.* 19.205f. (Penelope weeps listening to disguised Odysseus) ὡς δὲ χιὼν κατατήκετ' ἐν ἀκροπόλοισιν ὄρεσσιν,/. . ./τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες·/ὣς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρήια δάκρυ χεούσης,/κλαιούσης ἑὸν ἄνδρα, παρήμενον, and as the 'flood of tears' metaphor in Philic. *SH* 680.40 would suggest. The metaphor would constitute another poignant contrast to the *locus*' heat.

Waves and calm sea appear in 54 and esp. 57. In 57f. the halcyons are said to have an effect on the sea which may adapt the sea's calm when Demeter came near it (cf. Call. *HyAp.* 18 εὐφημεῖ καὶ πόντος). The halcyons are said to be loved by the Nereids, the sea-water Nymphs with a power over winds (Hes. *Theog.* 252–4, Hdt. 7.191.2), and by fishermen. In 58 ἔσχατα φυκία the adj. is used in the same sense as in fr. 18 ὕκης . . . ἔσχατος, and the phrase may echo that fragment in inverted order. Fishing turns up in 60, cf. fr. 18. A four-year old Coan? wine appears in 65 Πτελεατικὸν οἶνον, cf. fr. 19. Lycidas' reclining besides his hearth in 66 πὰρ πυρὶ κεκλιμένος may recall the feasting-scene at Chalcon's palace. At a cultic level this would allude to the fire around which Demeter's mysteries were celebrated, see A-H-S 136–7, Burkert 1983, 276, *id.* 1985, 288.

Lycidas' unjustified and grotesque eagerness to drink his wine whilst remembering departed Ageanax in 69–70 πίομαι . . ./αὐταῖσιν κυλίκεσσι καὶ ἐς τρύγα χεῖλος ἐρείδων may be due to a motif ironically applied to fasting Demeter, who might have broken her fast at Chalcon's palace late in the evening, when Hesperus appeared, oblivious to Persephone's bereavement.[97] Nic. *Heteroioumena* fr. 56 >

[97] The motif hardly makes any sense in the Theocritean context: "I do not think I know what Theokritos wrote or meant at the beginning of this line" Dover ad loc.

Ant. Lib. 24.2 (Misme's potage to ardently thirsty Demeter) ἡ Δημήτηρ ἐξέπιε κατὰ τὸ δίψος τὸ ποτὸν ἀθροῦν may be Nic.'s employment of the same motif. καὶ ἐς τρύγα in Theoc. means '(drain) to the lees', but Hsch. φ 1537 explains τρύγα as a primitively-made, unfiltered wine, οἶνον ἀδιήθητον ἀπὸ ληνοῦ. For κυλίκεσσι, usually denoting a wine-cup, cf. Philic. *SH* 680.60 . . σοι κύλικας . . [ ]ε καὶ στέμματα κα . . απτον ὕδω[ρ] (of Demeter's cyceon?). χεῖλος ἐρείδων implies an act of kissing and may be a misapplication originally coming from Demeter's healing respiration on a sick child. The identity of the two pipers in 71f., an Ἀχαρνεύς and a Λυκωπίτας, would conceivably bear some significance. For the former name, Wil., *Hermes* 34 (1899), 616 suggested that it is a deliberate change from 'of Halasarna', a Coan deme at the centre and south of the island. For the latter, Σ 72a (97.15 Wendel) report of another Coan deme Lycope related to the Coan noble Lycopeus, mentioned in 4. In 85 ἔτος ὥριον (ἐξεπόνασας) 'spring' is the only exact parallel and seems a direct loan from fr. 10.2 ὡραίων . . ἐτέων. With ἐξεπόνασας one may compare the association of this verb with Philetas in Long. 2.3.3 κῆπός ἐστί μοι τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν, ὃν . . . ἐξεπονεσάμην.

Moreover, the botanical specimens associated with Lycidas are cryptically but directly related to Demeter and Persephone/the Underworld. Lycidas' garland consists of anise, roses and white stock, all three commonly used in garlands, 63–4 ἀνήτινον ἢ ῥοδόεντα/ἢ καὶ λευκοΐων στέφανον περὶ κρατὶ φυλάσσων. At the same time ἄνηθος, one of the ἀρώματα (Theophr. *HP* 9.7.3, *CP* 6.9.3, cf. Virg. *E.* 2.48) broadly used in cooking and medicine (Dover on Ar. *Nub.* 982), is related to Adonis, on whose bower it appears as a decoration in Theoc. 15.119 (cf. then [Mosch.] *EB* 100) and features in the burial of the Scythian king in Hdt. 4.71.1. Roses are associated with Perse-

---

Gow printed Valckenaer's αὐταῖς ἐν κ. relying on Σ 7.70a (97.3 Wendel) οὐ διαιρῶν εἰς μικρά, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀπνευστὶ πίνων. POxy. 3548 fr. 14.a.ii (pap. saec. p.C. II, ed. P. J. Parsons) has a gap at this point supplemented by the editor as αὐταῖ[σιν κυλί]κεσσι⟦ν⟧. There is no need for emendation here (so Gallavotti). The expression without σύν is an Atticism (Phrynichus Att. fr. 286 (169.21 Borries), Suid. α 4466, see A. Lobeck, *Phrynichi eclogae*, Leipzig 1820, 100) and Dover drew attention to similar expressions occurring in comedy of gluttons, such as Ar. *Ran.* 560 where Heracles eats cheese αὐτοῖς τοῖς ταλάροις, etc. Σ 7.70b (97.5 Wendel) may have got it right: τουτέστιν ἡδέως πίνων καὶ *ἀθρόως*, οὐ διαιρῶν εἰς τὰ μικρότατα τῶν ἐκπωμάτων. R. Hunter, *ZPE* 99 (1993), 11–4, cf. *id.* 26, draws attention to the similarity between Simon. *IEG* 22 and Theoc. 7.61f. On these lines see further G. Giangrande, *MPhL* 8 (1978), 63–6, A. M. Mesturini, *QUCC* n.s. 8 (1981), 105–12.

phone since she was gathering them in *HHD* 6 and were — and still are in Greece — commonly used on graves: Simias *HE* 5.3, *GVI* 728.3, 1201.1, 2005.37, 2029.8 (3rd to 1st cent. BC). So are, despite their white colour, ἴα, another aromatic flower (Theophr. *HP* 6.67), cf. *HHD* 6 with Richardson ad loc., Bacch. 3.2 Δάματρα ἰοστέφανόν τε κούραν, Theoc. 1.132 (Daphnis' death), *CEG* 578.iii.2 (*c.* 350 BC; a funerary garland ἴου στεφάνοις), Philod. *GPh* 26.8, *GVI* 1409.3 (2nd cent. AD?), 2005.37 (1st/2nd cent. BC) — in the last three passages a favourite flower around tombs.[98] Some of these flowers appear in the garden of Philetas in Long. 2.3.4 ῥόδα <καὶ> κρίνα καὶ ὑάκινθος καὶ ἴα ἀμφότερα, which may be an elucidating association.

The beans of 66 κύαμον δέ τις ἐν πυρὶ φρυξεῖ are most probably of Philitan provenance. As wine in fr. 19 and hyces in fr. 18, Demeter resented them too: in Pheneos she rewarded the hospitality of the locals and τούτοις τὰ ὄσπρια ἡ θεὸς τὰ ἄλλα, κύαμον δὲ οὐκ ἔδωκέ σφισι (Paus. 8.15.3). Consumption of beans was forbidden in her Eleusinian festivals.[99] Beans were, by tradition, food suitable only for an indigent table (cf. Athen. 2.54ef. and see Lembach 148). However, in lean times the Coans might have indulged in another unorthodox slip. For pulse in Cos cf. *LSCG* 168.15 (1st/2nd cent. BC) τοὶ ἔχοντες τὰν ὠνὰν . . ὀσπρί(ω)ν. Cooking on fire would tally with the image of primitive life in P.'s banquet-scene evoked with bone-tibia (fr. 20), possibly the *stibades*, the drinking of unfiltered wine and the ἀρβυλλίδες (on Chalcon's feet?), cf. here Plato *Rep.* 372c and see *At. Gl.* fr. 39.

In the neat 67–8 Lycidas anachronistically lies on a στιβάς by the fire-place: χὰ στιβὰς ἐσσεῖται πεπυκασμένα ἔστ' ἐπὶ πᾶχυν/κνύζᾳ τ' ἀσφοδέλῳ τε πολυγνάμπτῳ τε σελίνῳ. Couches roughly constructed from the boughs of soft plants were employed at primitive banquets, but progress replaced them with proper beds (κλῖναι), Plato *Rep.*

---

[98] The flora of the grave has been studied by G. Luck, *Philologus* 100 (1956), 279–82, cf. also Lattimore 129–31. On roses in particular see C. Kokkinia, *MH* 56 (1999), 204f. On the botanical Σ on Theocritus see Wendel 1920, 130f.

[99] Cf. Paus. 1.37.4 τῶν κυάμων ἀνενεγκεῖν οὐκ ἔστι σφίσιν [*sc.* to the Athenians] ἐς Δήμητρα τὴν εὕρεσιν. ὅστις δὲ ἤδη τελετὴν Ἐλευσῖνι εἶδεν . . . οἶδεν ὃ λέγω, Porph. *De abs.* 4.16, see Wächter 103, Gennadios 575–6, Parker 1983, 364–5. Porph. *Antr. Nymph.* 19 says that bees κυάμοις οὐκ ἐφιζάνουσιν, see further Burkert 1983, 285. Plut. *Aet. rom.* 286e says that legumes were commonly used πρὸς τὰ περίδειπνα καὶ τὰς προκλήσεις τῶν νεκρῶν, see Maas *Kl. Schr.*, 59–60.

372b, 373a. In civilised times they were commonly considered as rough and inconvenient, used perforce in the countryside, expeditions, or pilgrimages.[100] The feast described in Theoc. might imply that the participants in the banquet held in honour of Demeter at Chalcon's palace might have lain on στιβάδες made of plants of Demeter's choice. This would be meant to constitute an aetium for the beddings that women prepared on the bare ground during the second day ('Fasting') of the Thesmophoria in Athens and probably in Cos, a practice related to the notion of conducting the festival μιμούμενοι τὸν ἀρχαῖον βίον.[101] Cf. that at the happy end in Long. 4.38.1–2 Dionysophanes offers a feast (with πάντα γεωργικὰ καὶ ἄγροικα on the menu) to his guests, including Philetas, while they recline on *stibades*, πρὸ τοῦ ἄντρου στιβάδας ὑπεστόρεσεν ἐκ χλωρᾶς φυλλάδος καὶ πάντας τοὺς κωμήτας κατακλίνας εἱστία πολυτελῶς. παρῆσαν δὲ . . . <Φιλητᾶς καὶ> οἱ Φιλητᾶ παῖδες, further Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13.6 (~ Longus, Theoc. 7), where, after a sacrifice to the Nymphs in the countryside, the host Melissa proposes ἴωμεν . . . οἴκαδε καὶ κατακλινῶμεν.

Fleabane and asphodel are known to have been used in *stibades*. Σ 7.68a (96.8 Wendel) provide the seemingly irrelevant information ("that is not likely to be T.'s point", Gow ad loc.) about the plant's antaphrodisiac properties and its use in the Thesmophoria: ἔστι δὲ φυτὸν ψυκτικώτατον, ἔνθεν καὶ ἐν τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις ὑποστρωννύουσι τὴν θερμότητα τὴν κατὰ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἐκκόπτοντες, a function known from Theophr. *HP* 3.18.2, Dioscorid. *MM* 3.121, Σ Theoc. 4.25b (142.21 Wendel). κόνυζα first appears in Arist. *HA* 534b28 and Theophr. *HP* 6.2.6, then as poetic κνύζα in Theoc. 4.25, 7.68 and Nic. *Ther.* 70 (κόνυζα in *Ther.* 83, 875, 942, *Alex.* 331, cf. *Ther.* 615 κονυζῆεν φυτόν), cf. Hsch. κ 3144 κνύζα· . . . ἡ κόνυζα κατὰ συγ-

---

[100] On *stibas* see G-P on Antiph. *GPh* 9.1, Lembach 24–31, Blech 398–9, Fantuzzi on Bion *EA* 69–70. The bedding at a symposium is usually soft, cf. e.g. Sappho fr. 94.21 στρώμν[αν ἐ]πὶ μολθάκαν, Xenoph. 21 B 22 D-K πὰρ πυρὶ/ἐν κλίνῃ μαλακῇ κατακείμενον, . ./πίνοντα γλυκὺν οἶνον, ὑποτρώγοντ' ἐρεβίνθους, see K-A on Theopompus *PCG* 65.1–2 ἐπίνομεν . . ./κατακείμενοι μαλακώτατ' ἐπὶ τρικλινίῳ, K. M. D. Dunbabin, "Triclinium and Stibadium" in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Ann Arbor 1991, 121–48.

[101] On the religious *stibas* see Nilsson 1906, 318f., J. M. Verpooten, *RHR* 162 (1962), 147–60, Burkert 1985, 107 with 390 n. 79 and on *stibadeion* 'grove of worship with *stibades*' H. Lavagne, *Operosa Antra*, Rome 1988, 111–6. For the anaphrodisiac composition of the Thesmophoria-bedding see Burkert 1985, 443 n. 26 with reference to E. Fehrle, *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*, Gießen 1910, 139–54.

κοπήν. In *Ther.* 70 in a passage discussing herbs able to repel dangerous reptiles κνύζα is a plant used in *stibades* and Σ 70b (61.4 Crugnola, *q.v.*) report its use in the Thesmophoria too. The Σ here might not be providing just encyclopaedic information. They may well go back to Theon (fr. *106), in which case the information about the Thesmophoria would go along with a reference to P. As in Theoc., in Nic. a couple of lines later (73) asphodel appears in the same function. Asphodel is early linked to Persephone and the nether world, *Od.* 11.539 = 573 = 24.13, Luc. *Nec.* 11, *Philops.* 24.[102] For those who have no better option asphodel may serve as food as well, cf. Hes. *WD* 41, Theophr. *HP* 7.12.1, 7.13.3 and see Gennadios 157–9 for similar usages in modern times. Sudhoff 32 reported to have seen glades of asphodel on his way to Bourina.

σέλινον 'celery' is aromatic (Theophr. *HP* 1.12.2, Theoc. 3.23 εὐόδμοισι σελίνοις) and is often used in garlands, but in connection with στιβάδες it appears only in Diod. Sic. 16.79.3 ὑποζυγίων σέλινα κομιζόντων εἰς τὰς στιβάδας (Gow ad loc. and Lembach 34 miss out this passage). A reference to it here is a deliberate eccentricity, but it might be attributed to celery's association with the dead (an association of Sicilian origin?). Hylas in Theoc. 13.42 ominously sees θάλλοντα σέλινα around the spring of the Nymphs. Cf. also [Mosch.] *EB* 100, Hdt. 4.71.1, Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 118 (Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 676d) δοκεῖ τὸ σέλινον ἐπικήδειον εἶναι etc., Plut. *Tim.* 26.2 τὰ μνήματα τῶν νεκρῶν εἰώθαμεν ἐπιεικῶς στεφανοῦν σελίνοις· καὶ παροιμία τις ἐκ τούτου γέγονε, τὸν ἐπισφαλῶς νοσοῦντα δεῖσθαι τοῦ σελίνου, Pliny *NH* 20.113, and for the proverb Suid. τ 832 τοῦ σελίνου δεῖται, see Garland 26, 171.

A large part of this vocabulary is derived from scientific manuals and in a slightly altered form is introduced into poetry. The Demeter-background in Lycidas' remembrance-feast with piping, beans and wine, his garland, his bedding and song may hark back to P.[103]

---

[102] See Murr 240–3, Lembach 31–3, J.-M. Verpoorten, *AC* 31 (1962), 111–29 (synonyms), M. Biraud, "Usages de l'asphodèle et étymologies d'ἀσφόδελος" in *Phytonymes*, 35–46. It is the classic offering to chthonic deities, Persephone, Demeter, Artemis and to chthonic Dionysus in Theoc. 26.3–4.

[103] An intense Philitan presence in Lycidas' song was suspected on other premises by Bowie 79. He suggested that Lycidas was a character in Philitan bucolic: "I would expect the song that Lycidas sings (52–89) to evoke the form, tone and detail of some Philetan poetry, while of course adapting it in Theoc.'s own manner to offer the reader provocative *imitatio*".

Lycidas lies on a *stibas* made of soft plants related to the goddess. Theoc. and his friends in 132–5 lie on a couch made of σχοῖνος 'rush' (cf. Ar. *Plut.* 540f., Theophr. *HP* 4.12) and freshly-stripped vine-leaves, similar to Laertes' summer couch in *Od.* 11.192–4. The plants strewn in Theoc.'s bed are not related to Demeter, but they may be misplaced there from Chalcon's garden. Even so, the vocabulary might be related to *Demeter*. In 133 χαμευνίσιν is a form nowhere else attested. Theoc. uses elsewhere (13.33) common χαμεύνῃ, as A.R. 3.1193, 4.883. Forms in -ις such as fr. 17 δμωίδες, appear in poem 7 more frequently than usual and indeed in passages suspected of Philitan loans: 23 κορυδαλλίδες, 26 ἀρβυλίδεσσιν (Lycidas speaks), 133 χαμευνίσιν, 138 ὀροδαμνίσιν, 141 ἀκανθίδες, 155 Δάματρος ἀλωίδος (final *locus*).[104] In 134 οἰναρέοισιν, from the technical term οἰναρίζειν (Ar. *Pax* 1147), is an absolute hapax. Σ ad loc. (110.8 Wendel) specify them as κυρίως τὰ φύλλα τῆς ἀμπέλου with reference to Phaenias fr. 50, see *At. Gl.* fr. 43 ἔλινος *ad fin.* In Babrius 34.1–2 vine leafs are used in a celebration of Demeter.

The happy motifs of Lycidas' song are easily convertible to funerary ones. Garlands offered to the dead were, as nowadays, a common practice (Lattimore 135f., Fantuzzi on Bion *EA* 75, Blech 81f.). So was the crowning of the participants after a funeral ("a reassertion of the values of life", Parker 1983, 36). οἶνον ἀπὸ κρατῆρος ἀφυξῶ is equivocal; for libations of wine in funerals cf. e.g. *Il.* 23.220 (Achilleus) οἶνον ἀφυσσόμενος χαμάδις χέε with M. Andronikos, *AH* W, 26, 91f., Lattimore 127–8 and a jest on Anacreon's tomb in Anon. *FGE* 35a. In 66 assonant πὰρ πυρὶ κεκλιμένος (a *vox propria* for the 'lying' of the dead; echoed in Eryc. *GPh* 7.4 (oxherd) παρ' δρυὶ κεκλιμένου/) is dubious too. For στιβάς 'grave' see *LSJ* s.v. (5) and as a funeral bier cf. *Alcmaeonis EGF* 2.1–2 νέκυς δὲ χαμαιστρώτου ἐπὶ τείνας/εὐρείης στιβάδος, Hdt. 4.71.4, Bion *EA* 69, Virg. *A.* 11.67. Piping in 71f. is the typical funerary music, see Garland 32–3, West 1992, 23–4.

The unity of this nest of allusions to P. in Lycidas' song and in the *loca amoena* at the beginning and the end of the poem is guaranteed by their common association with Demeter and Persephone

[104] Theoc. in general likes such forms: 1.9 οἴιδα, 2.35 ἐρυθακίς, 4.59 ἐρωτίδα, 5.3, 139 ἀμνίδες, 5.50 ἀρνακίδας, 5.94 ὀρομαλίδες, 5.145 κερουχίδες (a frequency of bucolic terms in idyll 5), 11.7 πλοκαμῖδος, 15.6 κρηπῖδες, 15.21 περονατρίδα, 15.63 πρεσβῦτις.

or the nether world. The poplar in 8 = 136 is found in Persephone's grove in *Od.* 10.509–10 ἄλσεα Περσεφονείης/μακραί τ' αἴγειροι καὶ ἰτέαι ὠλεσίκαρποι and is often connected with death, *Il.* 4.482f., A.R. 4.604, Nonn. *D.* 2.155, Orph. *Arg.* 953. The Odyssean ἰτέαι ὠλεσίκαρποι are replaced in Theoc. with the similarly sounding and also fruitless πτελέαι from an Iliadic context. Elms are planted by Nymphs around the tomb of Eetion in *Il.* 6.419–20 and the tree became a symbol of grief. In Virg. *A.* 6.282–3 in the *vestibulum* of Hades *in medio ramos annosaque bracchia pandit/ulmus opaca, ingens,* see M. Schuster, *RE* IXA.553–4 and cf. the elms around Protesilaus' tomb (G-P on Antiph. *GPh* 23.3–4). Significantly, both elm (Theophr. *HP* 3.4.2, 3.14.2, see M. Schuster, *RE* IXA.545–6) and poplar (Theophr. *HP* 3.14.2, *CP* 1.1.3, see Lembach 115–7), were (falsely) considered as unfruitful trees.

In 144–5 ὄχναι μὲν πὰρ ποσσί, παρὰ πλευραῖσι δὲ μᾶλα/δαψιλέως ἁμῖν ἐκυλίνδετο pears and apples are mentioned in one breath, as in Call. *HyDem.* 27–8 ἐν δὲ καὶ ὄχναι,/ἐν δὲ καλὰ γλυκύμαλα in Demeter's sacred grove, cf. Demeter's μῆλα also in 11, 136, Σ bT (ex.) *Il.* 9.542b (II.517 Erbse) μηλοφόρον δὲ τιμῶσι τὴν Δήμητρα. One would hardly want to see a fortuitous point of contact here. The two are juxtaposed in Alcinous' garden in *Od.* 7.115 ὄγχναι καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μηλέαι ἀγλαόκαρποι and 7.120 ὄγχνη ἐπ' ὄγχνῃ γηράσκει, μῆλον δ' ἐπὶ μήλῳ in a passage that served as the model of fr. 9, and in Laertes' garden in *Od.* 24.340–1. Both bear subterranean associations, cf. *Od.* 11.589 = 7.115 (in Hades), Theoc. 1.134 (Daphnis' death), and Praxilla *PMG* 747.3 makes a good point when she says that death will deprive her of ὡραίους σικύους καὶ μῆλα καὶ ὄγχνας. Homeric (7x) ὄγχνη had a short career as ὄχνη in Theoc. 1.134, 7.144, Nic. *Ther.* 513 reappearing much later in Pallad. *AP* 9.5.1, 4.

Μῆλα are aromatic (Theophr. *De odor.* 5), as pears (*id. CP* 6.16.2), and can denote 'fruits' in general, see Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 136. What is probably meant here is the μῆλον Κυδώνιον 'quince', an aromatic fruit deriving its name from a town in Crete, with sexual properties (cf. Athen. 3.81c and see S. Döpp, *Hermes* 125 (1995), 341–5), from which the Coans produced a famous perfume. Apples, as pomegranates, were resented by Demeter and her initiates in Eleusis abstained from them, Porph. *De abst.* 4.16, see Wächter 106–7, Parker 1983, 361, 363. Such commodities had an intense presence in *Demeter.* μῆλα and ὄχναι would hardly figure in the *locus amoenus* along with black poplars and elms. Picked up from Alcinous' garden

they may have been transplanted to Chalcon's garden and from there they possibly appeared on the feasting table of the Coan king, as in Ov. *F.* 4.546 at Celeus' table. Fr. 17 indicates that the Coan palace may have been described in some detail. However, Theoc. throws everything into the same basket. Cf. also the association of such fruits with Philetas' garden in Long. 2.3.3–4 ὅσα ὧραι φέρουσι, πάντα ἔχων ἐν αὐτῷ καθ' ὥραν ἑκάστην ... θέρους μήκωνες καὶ ἀχράδες καὶ μῆλα πάντα, νῦν [i.e. in autumn] ἄμπελοι καὶ συκαῖ καὶ ῥοιαὶ καὶ μύρτα χλωρά.

Philitan voices seem to cease in Simichidas' song. It may be Asclepiades, mentioned side by side with P. in 40, who is at work here. Μυρτώ in 97 is a common name for hetairai, to whom Asclep.'s epigrams were so attentive. Vv. 118–9 βάλλετέ μοι τόξοισι τὸν ἱμερόεντα Φιλῖνον,/βάλλετ', ἐπεὶ τὸν ξεῖνον ὁ δύσμορος οὐκ ἐλεεῖ μευ bear resemblance to Asclep. *HE* 17.3–5 †ἢ μὴ καὶ τόξοις† βάλλετέ μ' ἀλλὰ κεραυνοῖς/καὶ πάντως τέφρην θέσθε με κἀνθρακιήν./ναὶ ναὶ βάλλετ', Ἔρωτες etc. (> Posid. *HE* 5). Then Asclep.'s "fondness of *kommos*-motifs may be important for 122–4", Hunter 1999, 162. A potpourri similar to Lycidas' song may be surmised here. A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 39 (1980), 7–27, esp. 25–7, acknowledged the intricate nature of Simichidas' song ("Coherence or Patch-work?") and adduced for its elucidation Archil. *IEG* 196a.26–8 ~ Theoc. 7.120–4 and Hippon. *IEG* 6 ~ Theoc. 7.103f., see also Hunter 1996, 24–5.[105]

Philitan echoes seem to resurface all the more strongly in the final section of the poem, 128f. In 130 Πύξα awakes Philitan reminiscences, cf. Σ 7.130–1d ~ fr. 16. In 136 the water flowing from within the Nymphs' cave is qualified as ἱερὸν ὕδωρ. That the adj. here is not simply *ornans*, as Gow thought, was rightly pointed out by Schönbeck 119–20. In the same verse (after 8) αἴγειροι πτελέαι τε comes up.

In 138 ὀροδαμνίσιν may hint at the striking ὀροδεμνιάδες, perhaps a Philitan coinage. ὀρόδαμνος is glossed by Hsch. ο 1273 as κλῶνες, κλάδοι, βλαστήματα, ὄρπηκες. The term is picked up from Theophr.

---

[105] These parallels are convincing, but Theocritean reception may be second-hand. Hunter 1996, 27 noted of Lycidas' song that "if Bowie's hypothesis, or something like it, is correct, then the song of Lycidas may be full of Philitan echoes, and Theocritus' archaic models will have been mediated to him through prior reworkings in Philitas".

HP 9.16.3 and might originally be a Cretan gloss as ἄεμμα in fr. 16, since it applies to the big twigs of δίκταμον 'dittany', a plant occurring, as nowadays, only in Crete (ἐν Κρήτῃ μόνῃ, Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 128). In poetry it appears in Call. *Inc. sed.* fr. 655, whence perhaps Antip. Thess. *GPh* 35.3, 106.3, and Nic. *Ther.* 863, *Alex.* 603. In Theoc. it is a hapax. Its original application may be suggested by a dactylic gloss in Hsch. ο 1275:

> ὀροδεμνιάδες· νύμφαι, καὶ αἱ μέλιτται. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους <καὶ> τῶν δεμνίων· ἐπεὶ ἐκεῖ κοιτάζονται. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀροδάμνων, οἵ εἰσι κλάδοι.

The ending -(ι)άδες is appropriate of Nymphs and ὀροδεμνιάδες, as the first explanation in the comment suggests, would refer to their habitat (> ὄρος + δέμνιον). The term would appear to be an exquisite variation of the Homeric hapax *Il.* 6.420 (Nymphs) ὀρεστιάδες. On the other hand, as the second explanation of the comment suggests, the term would literally apply to bees, as the word μέλισσα, according to an ancient etymology recorded in Σ Theoc. 3.13b (120.12 Wendel), derives its name παρόσον ἐπὶ τῶν μήλων ἱζάνει· μῆλα δὲ πάντα. τὰ ἄκρα τῶν δένδρων[106] = ὀροδαμνίδες, cf. Σ Theoc. 7.138a (110.15 Wendel) ὀροδαμνίδας δὲ παντὸς δένδρου τοὺς κλάδους λέγουσι. The placing of this information in Σ Theoc. 3.13b may not be fortuitous: the unnamed goatherd wishes to become a bee to enter the cave of the Nymph Amaryllis, αἴθε γενοίμαν/ἁ βομβεῦσα μέλισσα καὶ ἐς τεὸν ἄντρον ἱκοίμαν. Longus' Philetas in 2.7.4–6 is said to be in love with her. The Nymph's cave in association with a bee may have evoked a similar image of P., see p. 266f.

From its formulation it would seem that the lemma envisages the term ὀροδεμνιάδες as comprising, at the same time (i.e. in a single passage), meanings suitable as attributes to both Nymphs and bees.

---

[106] Cf. also Orion Theb. 102.29 > EtGud. 385.55 Sturz, EtG (AB) μ 121 Cavallini (*MCr* 15–7 (1980–82), 251), EtM 577.35, Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 773.51 (II.799 van der Valk), all appealing to the disputed (see West, ed. *Il.* ad loc.) *Il.* 9.542 καὶ αὐτοῖς ἄνθεσι μήλων, which is glossed ἀπὸ μέρους by Σ A 9.542a (II.517 Erbse), Apoll. Soph. 34.19, Hsch. α 5125 as τοῖς ἀκροδρύοις. This may suggest a treatment advancing this etymology of μέλισσα in connection with the disputed Homeric μῆλα (on these see Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 136). Strato's cook in *PCG* 1.23 τὰ μῆλα πρόβατα, for whose vocabulary his master needs to consult P.'s *At. Gl.* (T. 4), hints at this dispute.

The word may well be of Nymphs Μέλισσαι.[107] The Coan Nymphs who conceivably featured in the Philitan *locus amoenus* would suitably comprise the notions of 'Nymphs' and 'bees', and therefore be specified as Melissai so as to point out their association with Demeter. Attention to the Nymphs' habitat would accord with a similar preoccupation of Call. and co. Cos' former name *Nymphaea* (Pliny *NH* 5.134) suggests that in mythical times the island was believed to be frequented by such creatures. Note that Ethemeia, the wife of the mythical Coan king Merops, is *genere nympharum procreata* (Hyg. *Astr.* 2.16.1). Diogenianus may draw on a Σ on Theoc. 7.138 elucidating the Philitan context and suggesting dependence of the Theocritan term on P.

A word of such a form is redolent of a Hellenistic, Callimachean aroma.[108] Its metrical shape would strongly suggest that it covers the second hemistich of a pentameter, preceded by a long monosyllable. This is the favourite placing of Nymphs' attributes in Hellenistic pentameters, cf. Theoc. *HE* 5.2 (~ Antip. Sid. *HE* 8.8) | – Ἑλικωνιάσιν/, Theodor. *HE* 2.2 | – Ἀμαρυνθιάσι/, Alex. Aet. *CA* 3.22 | – ˘ ἐφυδριάδας/, 'Plato' *FGE* 16.6 Νύμφαι ἀμαδρυάδες/, then Call. *Aet.* fr. 66.9 = *HyPal.* 4 | – Πελασγιάδες/, and see Spanoudakis 2000, 39. The second hemistich of a pentameter in Parth. *SH* 626.3 survives as φυσεπιδεμνι̣[.

This Hesychian entry would supply evidence supporting Pfeiffer's 1968, 284 suggestion that in these lines an image from P.'s *Demeter* is at work. It would point to a passage in which the ambiguity of μέλισσαι as 'Nymphs/initiates of Demeter' and 'bees' featuring in Call. *HyAp.* 110–2 prefigured in P. Nic. *Alex.* 448f. may toy with the same ambiguity, see p. 304f.

V. 142 πωτῶντο ξουθαὶ περὶ πίδακας ἀμφὶ μέλισσαι probably reproduces a Philitan image. The pleonastic περὶ πίδακας ἀμφί, though common in epic, finds a parallel in *HHD* 276 with the striking περί τ' ἀμφί τε κάλλος ἄητο, cf. *Il.* 2.305 ἀμφὶ περὶ κρήνην, but only here are the two adverbs disjoined by the governed noun, nicely expressing the bees' flutter around the πίδαξ.

---

[107] First noticed by Cook 19. The association of Nymphs with bees (therefore 'Melissai') is very old, cf. *Od.* 13.104f., Charon Lamps. *FGrH* 262 F 12, see Cook 15–6, Roscher II.2, 2637–38.

[108] "Call. uti solet huiusmodi formis, v. Ἀκτιάδες, Πελασγιάδες etc." Pfeiffer on fr. 185. For full documentation see Lapp 146, E. J. Kenney, *CQ* n.s. 99 (1999), 330–2.

In 147 τετράενον (P. von der Mühl: -ενες codd., see K. Latte, *Gnomon* 23 (1951), 250) has a distribution very similar to fr. 11 ἄστλιγγας: δίενος and τρίενος occur in Theophr. *HP* 7.5.5 (ἑπτάενον· ἑπταετῆ Hsch. ε 5549). Then Theoc. uses τετράενος here of a four-year old wine (cf. the different diction employed in 14.15–6 Βίβλινον . ./εὐώδη τετόρων ἐτέων; from Theoc. Nonn. *D.* 19.122 ἰκμάδα τετραέτηρον . . Λυαίου) and Call. fr. 33 τετράενος, of a child's age which, technically speaking, signifies the end of infancy, cf. *HyAp.* 58 (Apollo) τετραέτης, Theodor. *HE* 1.2 κῶρος ὁ τετραέτης and Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1015. As with other rarities in poem 7, Theoc. may have misplaced the term to refer to wine, but Call. may have preserved the original context. This may be of relevance here, as Demeter κουροτρόφος (in Cos *HG* 8b.iii.24 = *LSCG* 154b.iii.24 of the 3th cent. BC) has a tradition of nursing babies, cf. *HHD* 219f. with Demophon later supplanted by 'Attic' Triptolemus (Iacchus in *OrphF* 52.2) and cf. Ascalabus in Nic. *Heter.* fr. 56. Demeter's attitude towards children is reflected in cult: in Eleusis among adult mystai a young boy was initiated in the mysteries each year with the task to "appease the goddess on behalf of all initiates" (evidence and discussion in Burkert 1983, 280–1). Demeter normally displays her medical power in association with a child (for such a possibility in P. see p. 237) and children often appear in hospitality scenes, cf. Call. *Aet. SH* 259.4 and see Hollis 1990, 344 n. 25. Speculating about that child's identity one may recall that Chalcon's sister Chalciope married (?, Call. *HyDel.* 161 may imply a furtive relationship) Heracles and gave birth to Thessalus, cf. *Il.* 2.679, Plut. *Aet. gr.* 304d (< Macareus *FGrH* 456?). If a child appeared in *Demeter*, images of children with a significance over poetics might be indebted to P., esp. the poetological metaphor of Erysichthon as a greedy βρέφος in *HyDem.* (cf. Appendix II), fr. 1.5–6 ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίσσω/παῖς ἅτε, Theoc. 1.47–8 ὀλίγος τις κῶρος ἐφ' αἱμασιαῖσι . ./ ἥμενος.[109] Σ Theoc. 7.147a (112.23 Wendel) provide the information that οἱ 'Αττικοὶ τὸ ἔτος ἔνος λέγουσιν, ἄλειφαρ δὲ τὴν ἀλοιφήν. P. discusses an Attic gloss in *At. Gl.* fr. 44

[109] ἐφ' αἱμασιαῖσι here would lend an intensively dramatic colour to the description of this image, if the lizard which possibly bit a child in P. is said in 7.22 to be taking a nap ἐν αἱμασιαῖσι. Note that the gecko Ascalabus in Ov. *Met.* 460 *latebramque petit* and that an αἱμασία surrounds Philetas' garden in Long. 2.3.5. ὀλίγος τις κῶρος may imply an infant, cf. *HHHerm.* 245, 456 of infant Hermes. Call.'s formulation in fr. 1.5–6 would befit the scarce words of a seriously sick child, cf. Theoc. 2.108–9.

ὄμπνιος. The term disappears afterwards. Greg. Cor. *De dial. Dor.* 90 mistook it for Dorian *cl.* Theoc. 7.147.

ἄλειφα, the Attic origin of which is attested only by the Σ here, is used next to ὄστλιγγες in Call. fr. 7.12 and might be the term P. used of Demeter's anointed hair, see p. 282. In P., as in Theoc., the term would further extend the subterranean allusions in the *locus amoenus*. It almost always finds a funerary application as a *vox propria* for the aromatic unguent used to clean and preserve the body of the dead, *Il.* 18.351 ἐν δ' ὠτειλὰς πλῆσαν ἀλείφατος, *Il.* 23.170, *Od.* 24.45, 67, Bion *EA* 67, Q.S. 14.265. On the forms ἄλειφα/-αρ see West on Hes. *Theog.* 553. The expression (πίθων) ἀπελύετο κρατὸς ἄλειφαρ may be another misplacement from Demeter's unguent head to the head of the wine-jars. "The figure is somewhat surprising" noted Gow ad loc., but note Theoc.'s commentator Amarantus (2nd cent. AD or later, see Gow i, lxxxiii) *apud* EtG δ 284 L. (EtM δ 344 L.) διεκρανώσατε· . . . παρὰ τὸ κάρα, διεκαρανώσατε . . . δοκεῖ γὰρ τῶν πίθων ἡ ἀλοιφὴ κάρα εἶναι and for the idea cf. Soph. *OC* 473 (κρατῆρες) ὧν κρᾶτ' ἔρεψον, Eubulus *PCG* 56.6 (κύλικα) κισσῷ κάρα βρύουσαν and the metaphoric κρήδεμνον as 'stopper (of a wine-jar)' in *Od.* 3.392.

The possibility that Coan Nymphs appeared in *Demeter* gains support from a number of indications.[110] In broad lines, Demeter and Nymphs share a cultic affinity due to their common association with vegetation, water and springs (Richardson on *HHD* 5). More specifically, Nymphs were broadly worshipped in Cos and a tradition surviving through Pliny *NH* 5.134 attests one of the island's previous names as *Nymphaea* (cf., of neighbouring Samos, Anacr. *PMG* 448 ἄστυ Νυμφέων). In local religion a link seems to have been established early enough. As Sh-W 329 observed, "the link between the Nymphs and Demeter in Cos may be of considerable antiquity since the archaic sanctuary of Demeter and Core was centred on a spring-house".[111]

[110] Bowie 84 attributed the Nymphs in Theoc. and Longus to P. on the basis of the combination of Theoc. 7.138–9 and Long. 1.4.3. From Prop. 3.3 (T. 23d) he cautiously gave him the Castalian Nymphs as well. Thomas 63–4 adopted the idea of bucolic Nymphs and presented a *Stemma Nympharum* from P. to Theoc. 7, Virg. *E.* 1, the garden of Corycius in *G.* 4.125f. and Long. 2.3.

[111] On the ancient cult of Nymphs in Cos see also M. Segre, *RIA* 6 (1938), 191f. Cf., in Cos, *LSCG* 152 (4th cent. BC), 153 (3rd cent. BC), *IdC* ED 81 (3rd cent. BC *ex.*), 186.6 (2nd cent. BC).

In literary terms, Nymphs appear as Persephone's companions in *HHD* 5 and along with the Graces in the reconciliation scene in Philic. *SH* 680.31–2, 51. In *Od.* 17.208f. (cf. also *Od.* 13.102f.) Nymphs figure in Ithace in a *locus amoenus* close to a spring surrounded by poplars. Then Nymphs come up in similar surroundings *and* in a Demeter-ambience in Cos in Theoc. 7.92, 136–7 . . . αἴγειροι πτελέαι τε· τὸ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἱερὸν ὕδωρ/Νυμφᾶν ἐξ ἄντροιο κατειβόμενον κελάρυζε, 154, and in Demeter's grove in Call. *HyDem.* 37–8 ἧς δέ τις αἴγειρος, μέγα δένδρεον αἰθέρι κῦρον,/τῷ ἔπι ταὶ νύμφαι ποτὶ τὤνδιον ἑψιόωντο (> Ov. *Met.* 8.746f.). The scenery in both Theoc. 7.131f. and Call. *HyDem.* 24f. bears a strong resemblance. The flora in both are almost identical; running water and Nymphs close to poplars and elms are there too. It would seem that P. first connected a *locus* set up with these constituents with Demeter. The place appropriate for Nymphs to appear in P. would be the location around Bourina. As the passages in Theoc. and Call. suggest, Nymphs would appear in *Demeter* at noon-time close to a spring and to poplars and elms. Both trees grow in the vicinity of water sources and are favoured by Nymphs.[112]

Longus' association of his oxherd Philetas with Nymphs may be a second-hand echo of such a scene, 2.3.2 Φιλητᾶς . . . ὁ πρεσβύτης ἐγώ, ὃς πολλὰ μὲν ταῖσδε ταῖς Νύμφαις ᾖσα, 2.7.4–6 (in love with Nymph Amaryllis), 2.17.1 ὁ Φιλητᾶς, ὁ δικαστής, ὤμνυε Πᾶνα καὶ Νύμφας. A proper reworking of the grotto-scene (see ff.) seems to appear in Long. 1.4, in the description of the cavern where Chloe was found, Νυμφῶν ἄντρον ἦν, πέτρα μεγάλη, τὰ ἔνδοθεν κοίλη, τὰ ἔξωθεν περιφερής· τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν Νυμφῶν αὐτῶν λίθοις ἐπεποίητο· πόδες ἀνυπόδητοι, χεῖρες εἰς ὤμους γυμναί, κόμαι μέχρι τῶν αὐχένων λελυμέναι, ζῶμα περὶ τὴν ἰξύν, μειδίαμα περὶ τὴν ὀφρύν· τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα χορεία ἦν ὀρχουμένων. ἡ ὤα τοῦ ἄντρου τῆς μεγάλης πέτρας ἦν τὸ μεσαίτατον. ἐκ πηγῆς ἀναβλύζον ὕδωρ ῥεῖθρον ἐποίει χεόμενον, ὥστε καὶ λειμὼν πάνυ γλαφυρὸς ἐκτέτατο πρὸ τοῦ ἄντρου, πολλῆς καὶ μαλακῆς πόας ὑπὸ τῆς νοτίδος τρεφομένης.

In 91–3 πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα/Νύμφαι κἠμὲ δίδαξαν ἀν' ὤρεα βουκολέοντα/ἐσθλά Coan Nymphs teach Simichidas how to write good poetry. This is a duty traditionally taken up by the Muses (cf. *Od.*

[112] For the Nymph's association with elms cf. *Il.* 6.421, A.R. 4.1427, a Hamadryad called Ptelea in Pherenicus Heracl. *SH* 672 (Athen. 3.78b), perhaps Hsch. π 4188 πτελεάδες· πτελεῶδες (see G. Radke, *RE* XXIII.1480 s.v. Pteleades) and see M. Schuster, *RE* IXA.553, G-P on Antiph. *GPh* 23.3–4.

8.480–1, 8.488, Hes. *Theog.* 22–3 αἵ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδήν,/ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὑπὸ ζαθέοιο), but as the locality around Bourina may have early been associated with Hippocrene, these same Nymphs are identified with the Heliconian Muses. Nymphs are associated with good poetry in Theoc. (see Gow ad loc., Kambylis 38f., Elliger 341–2) and for mountain-Nymphs singing and dancing around a well, as the Hesiodic Muses, see Kambylis 40–1 *cll. Od.* 12.318, Call. *HyArt.* 170f., A.R. 4.1198, West on Hes. *Theog.* 7 *cll. HH* 19.19f., *Cypria EGF* 5, A.R. 1.1221f. As in Theoc., it may be Nymphs that teach similar precepts in Call. T. 7a.11–2 Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, α[ἵ γ' ἁπαλαί τοι/νήνιες?] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή. The characterisation of the Nymphs as ἁπαλαί tallies with the sensational description of the statues of the Nymphs in their cave in Long. 1.4.2 and the conjectural νήνιες] would accord with the Nymphs' common appellation as κοῦραι, παρθένοι, *puellae* (H. Herter, *RE* XVII.2.1547; add Euph. *SH* 416.2 παρθενικαὶ Λ[ι]βηθρίδες). Could διδάσκω in Theoc. and Call. imply that in the final section of *Demeter* P. claimed to have been taught his art by them? One of the Muses (Mnemosyne, he thinks) preaches to Prop. in T. 23d.37f. and cf. further the Nymphs' addresses to Daphnis in Long. 2.23 (ἡ πρεσβυτάτη), 3.27.2. The conception would rely on the Theogonic proem.

In 136–7 (αἴγειροι πτελέαι τε·) τὸ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἱερὸν ὕδωρ/Νυμφᾶν ἐξ ἄντροιο κατειβόμενον κελάρυζε water is flowing from a grove sacred to the Nymphs of Cos (note ἐγγύθεν as contrasted to 140 τηλόθεν of the ugly crying of the tree-frog). We know that Nymphs were actually worshipped in caves in Cos, as in other places, from the cave of Aspripetra at Isthmus, which was sacred to Pan and the Nymphs (D. Levin, *ASAA* n.s. 8/9 (1925/26), 235f.). The activities of the Nymphs taking place in that grove may be suggested by its Odyssean model. In an ἄντρον . . ./ἱρὸν Νυμφάων with buzzing bees and running water in *Od.* 13.107–8 ἐν δ' ἱστοὶ λίθεοι περιμήκεες, ἔνθα τε Νύμφαι/φάρε' ὑφαίνουσιν ἁλιπόρφυρα, θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι. As Bourina is modelled on the Ithacan spring described in *Od.* 17.205f., so the Coan Nymphs' cave could resemble the Ithacan grotto in 13.102f. Such activities are equally suggested by their Propertian echo in T. 23c.5 (Call. and P.) *dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro?. pariter* 'in unison' suggests the immediate source of Prop. as well as the ultimate source of this image. *tenuastis* is a metaphor from spinning. A more elaborate description of a poetical grove is shown to Prop. by Apollo through a *nova* . . *semita*, where each Muse busies

herself according to her allotted realm. That scene ends with T. 23d.51–2, the only Propertian reference to P. without Call. by his side. Here the substitution of the original Coan Nymphs with the Heliconian Muses becomes apparent. Then Stat. T. 25 *ipse Coo plaudente Philitas/Callimachusque senex Umbroque Propertius antro* hints at this image and puts all three poets together. The Propetian cave is ornated with elaborate poetical symbols, *hic erat affixis viridis spelunca lapillis,/ pendebantque cavis tympana pumicibus,/orgia Musarum et Sileni patris imago/fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeaee, tui.* Long. 1.4.3 describes similar objects in an ἄντρον Νυμφῶν in Lesbos, ἀνέκειντο δὲ καὶ γαυλοὶ καὶ αὐλοὶ πλάγιοι καὶ σύριγγες καὶ κάλαμοι, πρεσβυτέρων ποιμένων ἀναθήματα and P. may be the common source here. The diverse *orgia Musarum* would allude to the principle of *poikilia.* Ovid in the programmatic *Am.* 3.1.3, which firmly belongs to the tradition discussed here, met Elegy in a divine grove, where *speluncaque pumice pendens* features.

Call. apparently made use of this scene, perhaps in the context of T. 6 τῷ ἴκελον τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κώϊον, cf. Prop. T. 23a.6 *totum de Coa veste volumen erit.* Note that in the Sicilian sea-shore grove where Demeter hides Persephone in Nonn. *D.* 6.133 they come across a λάινον ἱστὸν . . μεμηλότα γείτοσι Νύμφαις which Persephone then uses to weave, further Porph. *Antr. Nymph.* 7 (in the books of the θεολόγοι) ἡ Δημήτηρ ἐν ἄντρῳ τρέφει τὴν Κόρην μετὰ τῶν νυμφῶν. Persephone herself has a long-established association with loom and weaving. For her loom, her weaving basket and Nymphs in association with Demeter cf. Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 89 (Demeter) ἐπ[άγου]σạν δὲ τὸν κάλαθον ταῖς νύμφαις σὺν τῷ ἱστῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς Περσεφόνης ᾱ [i.e. πρῶτον] μὲν παραγενέσθαι εἰς Πάρον καὶ ξενισθεῖσαν παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ Μελισσῷ χαρίσασθαι ταῖς τούτου θυγατράσι οὔσαις ἑξήκοντα τὸν τῆς Φερσεφόνης ἱστόν. P. may have featured a grotto in the area of Bourina in which, according to a Coan tradition, Nymphs were once fabricating fine garments, cf. Arist. *HA* 551b16 (silk) πρώτη δὲ λέγεται ὑφῆναι ἐν Κῷ Παμφίλη Πλάτεω θυγάτηρ (a Nymph?). The poetological inferences of that passage would be obvious.[113]

---

[113] All features here combined in a novel context have their feet on a solid epic ground. Nymphs by tradition weave in caves (other than the Ithacan Nymphs in *Od.* 13.107f. cf. Calypso in *Od.* 5.62 and the Parnassian Nymphs in Philoxen. *PMG* 829), and while weaving they sing (and sometimes dance), as Circe in *Od.* 10.221–3 (~ Virg. *A.* 7.14). The grove is very much a poetical place, cf. Pind. *P.* 6.49 (δρέπων) σοφίαν δ' ἐν μυχοῖσι Πιερίδων and the traditions that Homer (Paus. 7.5.12) and

The same Nymphs are said to mingle the wine in Phrasidamus' farm in 154. This activity may be anticipated in *Od.* 13.105–6 (in a Nymphs-grotto) ἐν δὲ κρητῆρές τε καὶ ἀμφιφορῆες ἔασι/λάινοι and accords well with Coan practices in the cult of Demeter, see fr. 19. Mingling of wine may have occurred in *Demeter* at the banquet scene and Theoc. takes it up with its poetological significance, see p. 271.

In 148 Νύμφαι Κασταλίδες Παρνάσιον αἶπος ἔχοισαι etc. it is not the Coan, but the Castalian Nymphs of Parnassus who appear as patrons of two different poetic themes. For Παρνάσιον αἶπος cf. P.'s possible Ἀργανθώνιον αἶπος in fr. 26. The appearance of the Castalian Nymphs in Theoc. may be due to a claim for inspiration from a source enjoying universal, not only local, recognition. The Coan Nymphs are placed under those of Castalia. It may be that this association of Coan Nymphs/Melissai with their Castalian primogenitors featured in P., in which case a recondite tradition, having the Heliconian king Melisseeis and his daughters-Nymphs involved in Hesiod's encounter with the Nymphs/Muses, may have been evoked to facilitate such an association (Nic. *Ther.* 11–2 with Σ 11c). A dactylic gloss in Hsch. μ 1294 μητροπόλους· τὰς πάλαι Μελίσσας (discussed in Appendix I) might support this possibility.

In a rhetorical question the Castalian Nymphs are said to have mixed a wine paralleled to the wines of Polyphemus/Odysseus and Chiron/Heracles. These two incidents are here adduced in a subversive way for their notoriously ill-fated outcome, resulting in mutilation and death respectively. M. Fantuzzi, *PCPS* 41 (1995), 28 remarked that "both questions which Theocritus asks the Nymphae imply in fact a negative answer" (cf. also Kyriakou 224–5). Indeed, this is an effective wine. For Theoc. it may be meant to account for his extended confusion of Philitan motifs in idyll 7. Wil. 1924 ii, 136 n. 3 suggested that Theoc. pleads wine to justify arbitrary changes, such as Ἁλασαρνεύς into Ἀχαρνεύς in 71.

From an aural point of view the profusion of sounds in the final *locus* is chaotic: the cicada sings together with the tree-frog, inconspicuous and non-melodic birds are brought together with melodic

---

Euripides (Philoch. *FGrH* 328 F 19) composed in the recess of caves (see Kambylis 103–4). This is a topos with the Romans, see N-H on Hor. *C.* 2.1.39–40, M. Paschalis, *Hellenica* 33 (1981), 35f., Fedeli on Prop. 3.5. Nymphs also have an obsession with fine garments, cf. *Od. ll.ll.*, Leto's cave in Delos in *HHHerm.* 250, Nicod. Her. *FGE* 4.1–2 φάρεα Νυμφῶν/λύγδινα, Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 906.12].τα περὶ χροϊ νύμφαι ἔχο[υ]σαι.

ones. A similar profusion of bird-voices appears in Ovid's meeting with Elegy, *Am.* 3.1.4 *latere ex omni dulce queruntur aves* and the epiphany of Demeter may have been hailed by it, as with the mid-summer epiphany of Apollo in Alc. fr. 307c (Himerius *Or.* 48.10–1) ᾄδουσι μὲν ἀηδόνες αὐτῷ . . . ᾄδουσι δὲ καὶ χελιδόνες καὶ τέττιγες . . . πάντα τὰ μέλη κατὰ θεοῦ φθεγγόμεναι. The image of the cicada is prominent, 138–9 τοὶ δὲ ποτὶ σκιαραῖς ὀροδαμνίσιν αἰθαλίωνες/τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες ἔχον πόνον. Cicadas, by a long-established tradition, sit on the twigs of trees in hot summer and sing with a tenuous voice at midday, when the sun becomes harsher and everything else is silent (see Davies-Kathirithamby 115f., Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 1095, Nünlist 45f.). If cicadas featured in P., they would probably appear in the midday discussion of Chalcon with Demeter in the shade of a plane-tree. Note that in Plato *Phdr.* 258ef. Socrates and Phaedrus hold a conversation close to Ilissus, seated under a plane-tree (229a) with the shrilling sound of cicadas (ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἡμῶν οἱ τέττιγες ᾄδοντες καὶ ἀλλήλοις διαλεγόμενοι), where their association with the Muses is explained in the form of a myth. The purpose of that myth is to point out the value of sustaining discourse during the midday heat (ἐν τῷ πνίγει) instead of falling asleep, which is ἀνδραποδῶδες. The question recurs in Theoc. 7.21f. and it may have been raised at Chalcon's and Demeter's midday discourse under the plane-tree. The inclination of the dew-fed insect (Plato *Phdr.* 259c, Call. fr. 1.34, further Davies-Kathirithamby 123f.) to sing, would not be affected by Demeter's famine. λαλαγέω occurs before this passage twice in Pind. *O.* 2.97, 9.40 in poetological contexts (Kyriakou 218–9, 221–2). These Theocritean cicadas embody the poetic ideal of πόνος and become an important symbol of the new poetry in Call. fr. 1.29–30 ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ ἀείδομεν οἳ λιγὺν ἦχον/τέττιγος, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων,[114] cf. then Theoc. 1.148, Posid. *HE* 6.1.

In 139–40 ἁ δ' ὀλολυγὼν/τηλόθεν ἐν πυκιναῖσι βάτων τρύζεσκεν ἀκάνθαις with τηλόθεν contrast the melodious ἱερὸν ὕδωρ flowing ἐγγύθεν in 136. The ὀλολυγών is likely to be identified with the tree-frog (Gow ad loc., but see E. Calderon, *QUCC* n.s. 67 (2001), 133–9).

[114] If the elegant song of the cicadas in Call. is indebted to their appearance in P., the image of the braying ass (a grotesque version of a horse?) might be a feature picked from the long (and heroic?, cf. 3–5) poem contrasted to *Demeter* in 9–12 (T. 7a). In terms of symbolism the contrast has a value of its own, see E. Livrea, *SIFC* 14 (1996), 56–8.

τρύζεσκεν is a consort verb of the song of an ὀλολυγών in Arat. 948 (and Agathias *AP* 5.292.5–6, *Geopon.* 1.3.11) and it evolved to be an important verb in the battle over poetics, Call. fr. 1.1 πολλάκ]ι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῇ. It is an Iliadic hapax (9.311) and may originate in the world of indefatigable but monotonous birds. Note *dulce queruntur aves* in the grove where Ovid met Elegy in *Am.* 3.1.4. ἀκάνθαις may also have been later employed in an allusive context, cf. Antip. Thess. *GPh* 20.2 ποιητῶν φῦλον ἀκανθολόγων. Pfeiffer essayed to establish it in Call.'s address to the Telchines in fr. 1.7 *fin.* φῦλον ἀ[κανθές, but the Σ Lond. ad loc. suggest ἀ[ηνές (see Massimilla ad loc.). These lines bear a veiled resemblance to the disparaging simile between young Simichidas and Asclepiades and P. in 39–41 (T. 5) as a frog (βάτραχος ~ ὀλολυγών, independently of its exact identification) competing with ἀκρίδας. The latter are in many respects associated with cicadas: in Arist. *De aud.* 804a23 cicadas, nightingales and *akrides* are lined up as endowed with voices that are λιγυραί and in Anyte *HE* 20 a cicada and an *akris* are buried together (further evidence in Davies-Kathirithamby 137–8). Here the tendency to turn Philitan terminology into one conveying poetological significance appears to be at work.

For 141 ἄειδον κόρυδοι καὶ ἀκανθίδες, ἔστενε τρυγών cf. Call. *HyDem.* 94 (of Erysichthon) κλαῖε μὲν ἁ μάτηρ, βαρὺ δ' ἔστενον αἱ δύ' ἀδελφαί. The verb στένω is employed here, as nowhere else, of a bird whose appropriate verb would be τρύζεσκεν used of the tree-frog in the previous line. στένω would be appropriate of a mourning figure such as Demeter, cf. Nonn. *D.* 6.107 (Demeter) ἔστενε μειδιόωσα, Call. *l.c.* The association of melodious sounds of the kind described in Theoc. with P. may be suggested by the birds crowding Philetas' garden in Long. 2.3.5 εἰς τοῦτον τὸν κῆπον ὀρνίθων ἀγέλαι συνέρχονται τὸ ἑωθινόν, τῶν μὲν ἐς τροφήν, τῶν δὲ ἐς ᾠδήν· συνηρεφὴς γὰρ καὶ κατάσκιος καὶ πηγαῖς τρισὶ κατάρρυτος (as Bourina and its surroundings).

In 154–5 οἷον δὴ τόκα πῶμα διεκρανάσατε, Νύμφαι,/βωμῷ πὰρ Δάματρος ἁλωίδος, the term διεκρανάσατε is a striking absolute hapax. In this context it is usually supposed to mean 'mingle (wine) with spring water' (*LSJ Suppl.* s.v. διακρηνάω). The verb's primary meaning is 'cause a fountain to spring up' (see Hunter ad loc.). The Σ know of a *v.l.* διεκρανώσατε which Σ 154b (114.11 Wendel) explain as ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐποιήσατε and Theoc.'s commentator Amarantus

ap. EtG δ 284 L. as ἀνεῴξατε. However, the meaning 'mix (wine)' seems more likely here, as Theoc.'s lines might allude to an image which P. might have employed in the scene of Chalcon's banquet (for a presumptive trace see Appendix I on Hsch. ν 354 νεοστεφέος· νεοκράτου). This is a common image bearing poetological connotations in Pindar (*O.* 6.91, *I.* 5.25, 6.1–3 Θάλλοντος ἀνδρῶν ὡς ὅτε συμποσίου/δεύτερον κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων/κίρναμεν, *Fr. dub.* 354 ἀνοῖξαι πίθον ὕμνων) and elsewhere, see Nünlist 199f.

In 155–6 (Δάματρος ἀλωίδος) ἇς ἐπὶ σωρῷ/αὖτις ἐγὼ πάξαιμι μέγα πτύον Theoc. acknowledges that he confers his poem as a tribute to 'Demeter', see Appendix III *ad fin.* In 156–7 ἃ δὲ γελάσσαι/*δράγματα καὶ μάκωνας ἐν ἀμφοτέραισιν ἔχοισα Demeter is made to smile, not because of anything funny, as usual, but because as a goddess of poetry she approves of Theoc. She holds in either hand handfuls of corn and poppies. Both are very common attributes of hers and both appear in Call. *HyDem.* 19–20 καλάμαν τε καὶ ἱερὰ δράγματα πράτα/ἀσταχύων ἀπέκοψε and esp. 43–4 (Demeter disguised as a priestess) γέντο δὲ χειρί/*στέμματα καὶ μάκωνα. Theoc. may preserve an originally Philitan expression. If poppies were collected by Demeter to break her fast, as in Ov. *F.* 4.531–2 *illa soporiferum . . ./colligit agresti lene papaver humo* (cf. also one of Persephone's companions in *ibid.* 4.438 *illa papavereas subsecat ungue comas* and see Hinds 89–90), δράγματα, originally 'handfuls (of stalks of corn)', would be a witty metaphor for the goddess of (temporarily non-growing) cereals, cf. Σ Theoc. 10.44a (236.1 Wendel, *q.v.*) ὅσα ὁ θερίζων λαμβάνει ἐν τῇ ἀριστερᾷ χειρί, παρὰ τὸ δράττειν, Hsch. δ 2290, Σ bT *Il.* 18.552a (IV.552 Erbse), then Nic. *Ther.* 666–7 ἄγρεο ποίην,/δράχμα χερὸς πλήσας. Call. having used δράγματα above recalls the similarly sounding στέμματα from *Il.* 1.14 /*στέμματ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν (ἑκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος) of the Chryses-supplication, cf. also Philic. *SH* 680.60 στέμματα on Demeter's head, in Cos *HG* 1A.30, 37 = *LSCG* 151A.30, 37 (4th cent. BC) and in general Sokolowski on *LSCG* 17B.22. μήκων is a Homeric hapax (*Il.* 8.306) associated with death, cf. also *Il.* 14.499 (κώδειαν), Stesich. *PMGF* S 257.i.9, Virg. *A.* 9.436. This image of Demeter holding handfuls of poppies in her hands, common to Theoc. and Call., may hark back to P.

We will probably never be able to appreciate idyll 7 in its full depth without solid evidence from its *Demeter*-background. However, it can still be determined that the reception of P. is intensively

recreative. It multiplies contradictions figuring in *Demeter*, such as a sorrowful mother in agreeable scenery or famine with abounding commodities and exuberant vegetation. Lycidas' song consists of motifs from *Demeter*, employed in a completely different, often deliberately ill-assorted, context. Diction strongly suspected of having been derived from P. is conglomerated to form novel constructions. Plants belonging to different contexts are placed together. Ironically, abundant vegetation consists of fruitless trees or plants related to the bareness of land, just as the lovely locale in what is supposed to be Phrasidamus' private estate consists of plants bearing gloomy associations with the chthonic world. Other elements, such as celery in Lycidas' *stibas* or ἄλειφα on the head of a jar, seem pointedly misplaced. The whole poem seems to have been conceived as a πᾶν ἐπ' ἀλαθείᾳ πεπλασμένον . . ἔρνος (44). As a result of this massive heterogenous accumulation in the final scene, reality — even the conventional literary reality — is abandoned.[115] Why all this? The profusion of the description, as Hutchinson 209–12 observed, functions as a climax: "Theocritus is now excelling the poets he has shown us". The main narration is contained between two idyllic scenes, the second being an expanded version of the first. The correspondences are meant to be unmistakable, cf. 1–2 ~ 131–2 (Simichidas, Eucritus, Amyntas), 7f. ~ 135f. (sources and their surroundings). When the poet accomplished his itinerary, his initial aspiration is lavishly surpassed. Note the complacency of 134 γεγαθότες upon his (and his friends') arrival at their destination.

Lycidas is a key-figure. His introduction in the poem may bear features with which P. described Demeter. His song seems to touch *Demeter* on so many points that it looks like a studied patch of Philitan motifs sown together. If 'Demeter' confirmed P. as an excellent poet, Theoc. seems to present the entity who confirmed him as a poet as a transformed offspring of hers. There should be no doubt that Theoc. pays his self-styled tribute of honour to the old master, just as there should be no doubt that he regarded himself a poet superior to him (cf. 40–1 *οὐ γάρ πω* ['not yet'] *κατ' ἐμὸν νόον* οὔτε . . ./ Σικελίδαν νίκημι . . . οὔτε Φιλήταν). Eventually, Lycidas retires from

[115] See Schönbeck 77, Elliger 335–6, Arnott 1984, 333–46, Pearce 294f., Kyriakou 217f. Curiously, Lembach 19–21 regarded Alcinous' garden in the *Od.* as a "Wundergarten" while that of Phrasidamus in Theoc. 7 as "mehr alltäglich".

the scene: the *locus amoenus* is not to be secularised. Theoc.'s conviction of his artistic superiority is an esoteric matter.

IIIb1. *Callimachus*, Hymn to Apollo

That Call. absorbed more of *Demeter* in *HyAp.* than in *HyDem.* is not as curious as it would at first seem. The hymn celebrates Apollo, the god most honoured in Cyrene.[116] The poem's affinity with *Demeter* relies on Cyrene's similarity to Cos, Apollo's similarity to Demeter and on the similarity between P.'s allegiance to Cos and Call.'s allegiance to Cyrene. At the end, the three parameters converge upon establishing Call.'s poetic alliance with P. Pfeiffer 1968, 284 had postulated a close affinity between the two poems.

Cyrene, as Cos, "perhaps because of its remoteness from the main centres of Greek life . . . inspired warm, indeed affectionate feelings in her children until the end of antiquity, when Synesius was bishop of Ptolemais, the city of the Cyrenean Pentapolis" (Fraser i, 786). Both Cyrene and Cos were Dorian, cf. emphatic Δωριέες (89). The festival with which the hymn is brought into connection is the Carneia, a typically Dorian celebration of Apollo.[117] Both places have a Thessalian connection. Call.'s version accepts a Thessalian settlement in Thera (cf. 95, see Williams on v. 89) from where the settlers sailed off to Libya. As Cos, Cyrene is fertile, 65 βαθύγειον ἐμὴν πόλιν (see Williams ad loc.; add Hdt. 4.199). It also has a water source dedicated to Apollo (88 πηγῇσι Κύρης, known to Pind. *P.* 4.294 and Hdt. 4.158.3 as κρήνη 'Απόλλωνος) and a legendary king with the same name (92 Eurypylus, cf. Pind. *P.* 4.33) and the same father (Poseidon) as his Coan counterpart, both of whom lived one generation before the events narrated in either poem. As in Cos, Cyrenean nobility is associated with the main god of the city and enjoys high patronage from him. In both poems it is the local cult of Demeter and Apollo

[116] See Chamoux 301–11, Fraser i, 653–6, A. Laronde, *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique*, Paris 1987, 169–71. Apollo's archaic temple in Cyrene was right at the centre of the city, Demeter's outside the city-limits.

[117] See Farnell iv, 131f., Gow on Theoc. 5.83 and cf. in Cos *HG* 2 = *IdC* ED 241, *IdC* ED 174.1 (both 4th cent. BC), *HG*, 35(p), an altar plaque dated in the 3rd cent. BC, *IdC* EV 219.8–9, EV 226.8 (both 1st cent. AD), see Sh-W 302, Craik 211. Some points of contact between the religion of Cos and Cyrene are discussed in *HG*, 55–6.

respectively on which emphasis is laid, cf. *HyAp.* 69–71. Most importantly, Call. is devoted to Cyrene no less than P. to Cos.[118]

As for Cyrenean Apollo, he seems to experience a calculated adjustment to the requirements set by Coan Demeter. In 26–7 Apollo's alliance with the Alexandrian king is established. The affinities intensify in the aretalogy section, 32–64. In 38–41 attention is diverted to Apollo's eternal beauty and his anointed hair. In 43–4 (cf. 19) his paradoxic *provinciae* of poetry and war are stressed (see K. Bassi, *TAPA* 119 (1989), 219–31), which are of particular importance in a poem involving polemics over poetics. In 45–6 (cf. 39–40) Apollo's medical capacity elicits attention. Apollo is also νόμιος, 47f. These may have appeared as features of Demeter in P. In the passage dealing with Apollo *ktistes* the correspondence is reinforced by an elaborate and protracted echo of fr. 19 in 56–7. In 65f. the Cyrenean nobility, the Battiads, is placed under the immediate patronage of Phoebus. In 80–3 a variety of significant flowers grow on Apollo's altar. In 93–6 the mutually beneficial commitment of Apollo and the deme of Cyrene concludes the section on Cyrene. In the final passage the two gods appear united as patrons of good poetry. It is likely that an eventual increase in Philitan verses — a prospect with only slight probability — would cast more light on the association of the two poets. The specifics may now be examined.

V. 1 ὄρπηξ is a word suitable to shady vegetation. It is a Homeric hapax (*Il.* 21.38, in a passage about the death of Lycaon) which appears in Hellenistic poetry in Theoc. 7.147 as hapax, cf. also [25].248, Call. here, fr. 194.10, A.R. 4.1425, Nic. *Ther.* 33, *GVI* 1913.4 (3rd cent. BC). We cannot say which word P. employed for the sanctified palace of Chalcon. μέλαθρον in 2 aptly comprises both meanings, 'palace' and 'temple', cf. *HHD* 188 of Celeus' palace, Nonn. *D.* 6.25 of the residence of Demeter's host Astraeus (*ibid.* 130, 134 of Demeter and Core's Sicilian cave). It is a word often associated with the abode of Hades. If Apollo's sublime theophany at

[118] For Call.'s love of Cyrene cf. above all *HyAp.* 65–96, *HE* 29, 32, the former evidencing that his family played a leading role in local society, fr. 602, on which see Fraser ii, 1098 n. 516, fr. 75.58–9 if (Aristaeus) Κυρῄ[νης/υἱό[ς is to be read (see A. S. Hollis, *ZPE* 86 (1991), 11–3) and see Pfeiffer ii, xxxviii–xxxix, Fraser i, 786–9, ii, 1095 n. 495, L. Lehnus, "Antichita Cirenaiche in Callimaco", *Eikasmos* 5 (1994), 189–207. Cameron 1995, 9–11 holds that some of Call.'s poems including the *HyAp.* were written in Cyrene at a later stage in Call.'s life.

the very outset of the hymn contains two direct allusions to P., the aphorism ἑκὰς ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός would acquire a strengthened poetic significance.

In 3 καὶ δή που τὰ θύρετρα καλῷ ποδὶ Φοῖβος ἀράσσει Apollo is said to be about to kick the door any minute now. As Williams ad loc. noted, "the un-Homeric flavour of the phrase (combined with the short alpha of καλῷ) . . . suggest that here καλῷ is being used in its Attic sense 'auspicious'". Prop. T. 23c.6 asks the shades of Call. and P. *quove pede ingressi?*, and Demeter in *HHD* 188 ἡ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἔβη ποσί enters Celeus' house to meet Metaneira and infant Demophon. In Ov. *F.* 4.537 this is only *limen ut intravit*. One would think that Demeter made a prosperous step while crossing the threshold of Chalcon's palace. "From very old times (possibly from a period when men prayed to divert a daemon from doing harm) it was the custom to prescribe in detail the manner in which a daemon or god was to make his entrance. Special attention was paid to his gait (*incessus*) and sometimes also to the manner in which he was to set his feet on the ground and to his footwear", E. Fraenkel, *Horace*, Oxford 1957, 204 n. 4 *cl. inter alia* Soph. *Ant.* 1144 (healing Dionysus) μολεῖν καθαρσίῳ ποδί, cf. further Delphis θύρας ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἀμειβόμενον ποδὶ κούφῳ (as the athlete that he was). Entrance with the good right foot is a lasting superstition documented by Mayor on Juv. 10.5 ("the gods are entreated to come *pede secundo* (i.e. Serv. Aen. viii 302 *omine prospero*) Aen. x 255"). P. may have used oblique terminology for Demeter's entrance, as a dactylic Hesychian entry may suggest, ε 6569:

ἕτερον πόδα· τὸν ἕνα πόδα {πόδα} τὸν εὐώνυμον.

Latte noted "ominis vitandi causa dictum". ἕτερον, as Hsch. ε 6567 explains, can mean ἄλλον . . . ἢ ἓν τῶν δυοῖν. ἢ ἀριστερόν and it would not be clear with which foot Demeter actually entered Chalcon's palace. The expression toys with an ambiguity in the description of Thersites in *Il.* 2.217 χωλὸς δ' ἕτερον πόδα, where Σ AbT (ex.; I.230 Erbse) note ἢ τὸν ἀριστερὸν ἢ τὸν δεξιόν, Σ D τῷ ἑνὶ τῶν ποδῶν. Therefore Prop.'s puzzlement *quove pede ingressi?* may represent an actual interpretative question. A further hint at this ambiguity may appear in the description of Elegy in Ov. *Am.* 3.1.7–8 *venit . . Elegia . . . / et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat* and in Catullus' aphorism against the *pessimi poetae* in 14.21–2 *vos hinc interea valete abite/ illuc, unde malum pedem attulistis*. Pind. *P.* 3.34 and Call. *Hec.* fr. 51.1–2 τις . . . δαίμων/τῶν

ἑτέρων employ ἕτερος in the sense κακοποιός. In similar terms, the Romans played with augural *laevus* 'prosperous' (for the Greeks), 'sinister' (for the Romans), see Bömer on Ov. *F.* 4.664. The rendering in Hesychius with εὐώνυμον admirably preserves this ambiguity, see *LSJ* s.v. II.2 'prosperous' and III.2 'ill-omened'. This speaks for a proficient source. This quotation from P. may have had a place in a hexameter with masculine caesura and bucolic diaeresis, as in the *Il. l.c.* The two words, as Demeter's feet, would be nicely divided between the two halves of the verse. This may have been noticed by both Ovid and Catullus *ll.cc.*; on the latter Verrall commented that *malum pedem* effects an unparalleled rhythm in the middle of the verse in Catallus.

If Prop. knew the Philitan origin of this line from a commentary, we may anticipate verbal loans as well (θύρετρα 4x in Homer, all of royal gates, 3x of Odysseus' palace; ἀράσσει 'hammer' is a Homeric hapax (*Od.* 5.248) later used of violent knocking on doors). Ironically, it is the same motif, but the other foot with which Apollo kicks Phthonos in 107 τὸν Φθόνον ὡπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν. The calming effect of Orion in Theoc. 7.54 χὠρίων ὅτ' ἐπ' ὠκεανῷ πόδας ἴσχει might also glance at this passage.

The vigorous knocking on the door of the μέλαθρον (τὰ θύρετρα . . . Φοῖβος ἀράσσει) may allude to another superstition picked from P., cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.447–8 (Demeter) *vidit/forte casam parvasque fores pulsavit.* As Chalcon and Demeter may have arrived at the Coan palace late in the evening, the Coan king may have jangled the bronze knocker of the palace's front-door. The resonant sound produced by the percussion of bronze objects was thought to consacrate and purify a place or a house and to avert evil.[119] The scene would be meant to lay down the Coan equivalent of the Eleusinian practice of the hierophant striking a bronze gong at late-evening, Σ Theoc. 2.36b (279.6 Wendel) ὁ τοῦ χαλκοῦ ἦχος οἰκεῖος τοῖς κατοιχομένοις· φησὶ <δ'>

[119] See the evidence in A. B. Cook, *JHS* 22 (1902), 14f., Courtney on Juv. 6.441–3, Gow on Theoc. 2.36, where Σ a (278.17 Wendel) refer to Apollod. Περὶ θεῶν *FGrH* 244 F 110 arguing that the jangling of bronze was taking place in eclipses and funerals ἐπειδὴ ἐνομίζετο καθαρτικὸς εἶναι καὶ ἀπελαστικὸς τῶν μιασμάτων. διόπερ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀφοσίωσιν καὶ ἀποκάθαρσιν αὐτῷ ἐχρῶντο. On ancient door-knockers (ῥόπτρα, see K-A on Ar. fr. 40, *LSJ Suppl.* s.v. II.1) cf. Plut. *De cur.* 516e νῦν μὲν εἰσὶ θυρωροί, πάλαι δὲ ῥόπτρα κρουόμενα πρὸς ταῖς θύραις αἴσθησιν παρεῖχεν. On purifying metals in general (esp. gold) see Parker 1983, 288. On the bronze parts of ancient doors see F. Ebert, *RE* VI.A.741–2.

Ἀπολλόδωρος (*l.c.*) Ἀθήνησι τὸν ἱεροφάντην τῆς Κόρης ἐπικαλουμένης ἐπικρούειν τὸ καλούμενον ἠχεῖον, Pind. *I.* 7.3–4 χαλκοκρότου . . ./ Δαμάτερος. "There is no doubt that the clashing of bronze in various forms was characteristic of her [i.e. Demeter's] cult" noted A. B. Cook, *JHS* 22 (1902), 15, see further Burkert 1983, 286 *cl.* Vell. Pat. 1.4.1 *nocturno aeris sono, qualis Cerealibus sacris cieri solet.* A reference to P.'s passage could stand in the ancient Σ elucidating Theoc. 2.36 (Hecate) ἁ θεὸς ἐν τριόδοισι· τὸ χαλκέον ὡς τάχος ἄχει, where Σ PAnt. (5th/6th cent., in Hunt-Johnson 38) render χαλκέον as [τ]ὸ κωδώνιν. The Σ on this line supply all this information from Apollodorus, who was familiar with P. and may have taken his passage into account. Call.'s exhortation for the μέλαθρον's doors to open up by themselves may be a contrasting response to that scene, 6–7 αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆες ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων,/αὐταὶ δὲ κλῇδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακρήν.

In 4–5 appear the palm-tree of Delos and the swan (cf. *HyDel.* 249f.), both closely associated with Apollo: οὐχ ὁράᾳς; ἐπένευσεν ὁ Δήλιος ἡδύ τι φοῖνιξ/ἐξαπίνης, ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἠέρι καλὸν ἀείδει. These verses may adapt to Apollo's requirements the Coan plane-tree and the bees, Demeter's sacred insect. Animals are generally said to be able to perceive the presence of a god, see Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 2. Dependence on P. is suggested by the affinity of swan/bees to their respective deities and to each other, as pure and poetic creatures (the swan already sings).

Vv. 9–11 ὡπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται ['shines'], ἀλλ' ὅτις ἐσθλός·/ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὗτος, ὃς οὐκ ἴδε, λιτὸς ἐκεῖνος./ὀψόμεθ', ὦ Ἑκάεργε, καὶ ἐσσόμεθ' οὔποτε λιτοί may adapt (with poetological connotations) Demeter's favours to her Eleusinian mystai, *HHD* 480–2 ὄλβιος ὃς τάδ' ὄπωπεν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων·/ὃς δ' ἀτελὴς ἱερῶν, ὅς τ' ἄμμορος, οὔ ποθ' ὁμοίων/αἶσαν ἔχει φθίμενός περ ὑπὸ ζόφῳ εὐρώεντι — or a passage modelled on these lines, cf. esp. Pind. fr. 137. In Long. 2.5.5, at the end of Eros' address to Philetas, a similar idea is expressed, καὶ χαῖρε μόνος ἀνθρώπων ἐν γήρᾳ θεασάμενος τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον. Prop.'s T. 23c.3 *primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos* etc. and Philetas' declaration in introducing himself to Daphnis and Chloe in Long. 2.3.2 ἥκω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅσα εἶδον μηνύσων, ὅσα ἤκουσα ἀπαγγελῶν may be vestiges from such a passage. The burden in 9 falls on ἐσθλός. This is a term to be expected in a poem dealing with the local nobility. It occurs 5x (4, 12, 39, 93, 100) in Theoc. 7, of which in 4 of Chalcon's descendants, in 12 of Lycidas and in 93 of Simichidas'

poetic output. Nowhere else in Theoc.'s Doric poems, see Williams 143 n. 3.

In 12–3 music comes up with Apollo's κίθαριν and dancing, which τοῦ Φοίβου τοὺς παῖδας ἔχειν ἐπιδημήσαντος. Both probably featured in a feast to honour the goddess in *Demeter* (there with the goddess' αὐλός, cf. fr. 20) and note the employment of cultic ἐπιδημήσαντος 'be in town'. In 28–9 Apollo is said to honour the choir ὅ τι οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀείδει,/. . δύναται γάρ, ἐπεὶ Διὶ δεξιὸς ἧσται. This is the place of a distinguished guest at a feasting table, beside the (king-) host. In view of Demeter's opposition to Zeus (fr. 13.1) the reference to Apollo deriving his power from Zeus' favour would carry a contrasting significance.

The manifold witticism in 16 ἐπεὶ χέλυς οὐκέτ' ἀεργός may be inspired by P. fr. 20.1 γηρύσαιτο δὲ νεβρός. Demeter's pipes are substituted with Apollo's lyre (cf. Call. fr. 227.1). Mute animals are said to be used in the production of musical instruments (see Williams ad loc.; add Sappho fr. 118 ἄγι δὴ χέλυ δῖα . . /φωνάεσσα †δὲ γίνεο†). The marvel of P. is absent in Call., but he surpasses his prototype with ἀεργός, which makes the additional point that the proverbially slow tortoise is turned into an instrument producing the quick motion of dance. A similar notion may occur in fr. 1.39–40 πτερὸν οὐκέτι κινεῖν/. . .]ῃ ṭ[ῆ]μος ἐνεργότατος, if the reference is to the swan's last song (see Massimilla ad loc.).

Amidst music and dance follows an exhortation for reverent silence. The stillness of the sea is pointed out, 18–9 εὐφημεῖ καὶ πόντος, ὅτε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί/ἢ κίθαριν ἢ τόξα, Λυκωρέος ἔντεα Φοίβου. The hush of nature inclusive that of the sea is typical in theophanies (cf. Theoc. 2.38 of Hecate, see Elliger 322–4), but the lines may specifically adapt the sea's calm at Demeter's presence, cf. in Lycidas' song in Theoc. 7.57f. the similar capability of the halcyons, beloved by the sea-Nymphs, the Nereids, and Virgil's adaptation, *E.* 9.57–8. Gods can of course easily calm the waves (N-H on Hor. *C.* 1.12.31), but the literary implication would be that at the presence of the goddess of good poetry the vast sea, representing the cyclic poets as in *HyAp.* 106, comes to a complete standstill.

In 20–4 Call. may make multiple references to P.:

> οὐδὲ Θέτις Ἀχιλῆα κινύρεται αἴλινα μήτηρ,
> ὁππόθ' ἰὴ παιῆον ἰὴ παιῆον ἀκούσῃ.
> καὶ μὲν ὁ δακρυόεις ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος,

ὅστις ἐνὶ Φρυγίῃ διερὸς λίθος ἐστήρικται,
μάρμαρον ἀντὶ γυναικὸς ὀιζυρόν τι χανούσης.

Thetis and Niobe, both *matres dolorosae*, may be adduced as covert parallels to Demeter. Due to Apollo's vindictiveness they have both lost their offspring but, as conceivably Demeter in P., their pain is now assuaged with music. In Call. Apollo's *paieon* is fittingly heard. κινύρομαι is an unHomeric term esp. apt of mourning mothers, see Campbell on Q.S. 12.486. Suggestively, in 22–4 the Cyrenean follows the Coan in making a reference to the contested *Il.* 24.614–7. But this is not all. V. *22 (Niobe) ἀναβάλλεται ἄλγεα πέτρος/ glances at fr. *13.1 (Demeter) ἄλγεα πέσσειν/. At a superficial level ἀναβάλλεται means 'puts off' and Σ Ψ render it as ὑπερτίθεται 'defers'. However, with it Call. may point to a version of the myth according to which Niobe was punished for making fun of the Letoids' clothes, see A. Lesky, *RE* XVII.1.662, cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 9.2 *superbiusque locuta est in Apollinem et Dianam quod illa cincta viri cultu esset, et Apollo vestem* <. .> *deorsum atque crinitus, et se numero filiorum Latonam superare.* This is an older version, cf. Radt on Aesch. *Niobe* fr. 155. Archaic lyric dealt with the myth extensively and the feature could go back to it. It may have appealed to Hellenistic poets, as in Simias *CA* 5 (Parth. *Erot. path.* 33) the ἔρις between Niobe and Leto is περὶ καλλιτεκνίας, cf. also Euph. *CA* 102 (Σ D *Il.* 24.602) ἐπαρθεῖσα δὲ τῷ πλήθει τῶν παίδων καὶ τῇ καλλονῇ ὠνείδιζε τῇ Λητοῖ ὅτι δύο μόνους ἐγέννησεν . . . καὶ ὅτι εὐτεκνωτέρα αὐτῆς ἐστιν. The Callimachean expression plays with the double meaning of ἀναβάλλεται as 'defers' and as vernacular 'puts on' (*LSJ* s.v. B.III).[120] Its parallelism with P. (other than their mutual debt to *Il.* 24.614f.) is clear: as Demeter digests not food but grief (fr. 13.1 *ἄλγεα* πέσσειν), so Niobe does not put on clothes but grief. The surprising πέτρος acoustically prompts πέσσω. This application of ἀναβάλλομαι finds a parallel with Homeric ἐνδύω, which is always used of putting on clothes, except from *Il.* 19.366–7 ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ/δῦν' ἄχος ἄτλητον of Achilleus ready to wear his new armour (Richardson on *Il.* 23.622). Other words playing with two possible meanings in the same passage are 19 ἔντεα 'weapons'/'musical instruments' and 23 διερός 'living'/'wet', see F. Williams, *MPhL* 5 (1981), 84–93, Rengakos 1992, 26.

---

[120] For a different insinuation as 'renews her afflictions' see D. L. Selden, *ClA* 17 (1998), 378.

In 33 τό τ' ἄεμμα τὸ Λύκτιον Call., discussing Apollo's bow and quiver, directly borrows P.'s ἄεμμα. This has been argued in fr. 16 to be a Cretan gloss, which Call. has additional reasons to take up considering the contribution of the Cretans to the foundation of Cyrene. The Cyrenean version insisted on this fact in contrast to the Theran one (Hdt. 4.154.1): according to Hdt. 4.151.2, 154, 161.2, Battos was a son of Cretan Oaxos, and Agroitas Λυβικά *FGrH* 762 F 1 reports that Nymph Cyrene was snatched away by Apollo first to Crete and then to Libya, see Chamoux 99–102, Vian on A.R. 4.1497. In 37 θηλείαις οὐδ' ὅσσον ἐπὶ χνόος ἦλθε παρειαῖς the word is of Phoebus' everlasting youth. οὐδ' ὅσσον perhaps refers to a memorable coinage by P. in *Hermes* fr. 4.2 οὐδ' ὅσον ὅσσον. Elsewhere in Call. only *HE* 3.9 οὐδ' ὅσον ἀττάραγον and probably *SH* 259.3 οὐδ' ὅσον ἑ.[, cf. also *HyAp.* 42 οὔτις τόσον ὅσον. ἐπὶ χνόος ἦλθε may echo fr. 14.1 ἐπὶ χρόνος ἔλθῃ.

Vv. 38–41 may transfer to Apollo several remarkable features of Demeter in P.:

αἱ δὲ κόμαι θυόεντα πέδῳ λείβουσιν ἔλαια·
οὐ λίπος Ἀπόλλωνος ἀποστάζουσιν ἔθειραι,
ἀλλ' αὐτὴν πανάκειαν· ἐν ἄστεϊ δ' ᾧ κεν ἐκεῖναι
πρῶκες ἔραζε πέσωσιν, ἀκήρια πάντ' ἐγένοντο.

First, Apollo's hair is attended to. Apollo *effeminatus* (37 θηλείαις . . . παρειαῖς) and ἀκερσικόμης shares this feature with Demeter. Call. avoids using ἄστλιγγες (or ὄστλιγγες) here; this he keeps (better: had kept) for another passage — and ἄεμμα just precedes in 33. Instead, he employs κόμαι, ἔθειραι. V. 38 contains three words possibly picked up from *HHD*: κόμαι occurs in Homer only in *Il.* 17.51, then *HHD* 279, both times without the article. θυόεις in Homer only *Il.* 15.153 of a cloud in which Zeus is wrapped, but the *HHD* is preoccupied with such adjj.: 97, 318, 490 of Eleusis (cf. also Pampr. 3.120) and of Demeter *HHD* 277 ὀδμὴ . . . θυηέντων ἀπὸ πέπλων, 231 θυώδεϊ . . κόλπῳ, where see Richardson. In Call. also *HyDel.* 300 (Delos), fr. 229.15 (Olympus). In Hellenistic poetry the adj. is always linked to the divine, see Campbell on Mosch. *Eur.* 68 (add *GVI* 267.1 (2nd/3rd cent. BC)), and could well have been employed as an attribute of Demeter in P.'s fragrant scenery before its application to Apollo's hair. πέδῳ is picked up (by whom?) from *HHD* 455.

Phoebus' hair is said to drip aromatic unguents, as the statue of

the Graces in Call. fr. 7.12. Demeter's divine fragrance is stressed in *HHD* 277–9:

> ὀδμὴ δ' ἱμερόεσσα θυηέντων ἀπὸ πέπλων
> σκίδνατο, τῆλε δὲ φέγγος ἀπὸ χροὸς ἀθανάτοιο
> λάμπε θεᾶς, ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενήνοθεν ὤμους.

P.'s possible reference to the gleaming godhead of Demeter in fr. 11 may be a response to this passage. Gods commonly give out a sweet odour.[121] P. might not have ignored this reference in the Homeric hymn, not least since Cos, as Cyrenaica, was famous for its aromatic unguents, cf. Athen. 15.668e–f drawing on Apollonius' medical treatise Περὶ μύρων of the 1st cent. AD and see P-H xliii, Sh-W 242–3 who draws attention to the name Ἀρωματίνη attested in an inscription from Isthmus (425 P-H). The Coan perfume-trade blossomed in Hellenistic times and the λιβανοπῶλαι were liable to taxation (*LSCG* 168.15 of the 1st/2nd cent. BC). This possibility is strengthened by Elegy's description in Ov. *Am.* 3.1.7 *venit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos* as well as by Eros' description in his encounter with Philetas in the latter's garden in Long. 2.4.1 ὑπὸ ταῖς ῥοιαῖς καὶ ταῖς μυρρίναις βλέπεται παῖς . . . λευκὸς ὥσπερ γάλα καὶ ξανθὸς ὥσπερ πῦρ, στιλπνὸς ὡς ἄρτι λελουμένος.[122] P.'s divine fragrance may intensly perfume Theoc.'s *locus amoenus* as well, cf. 7.132f. where πάντ' ὦσδεν θέρεος μάλα πίονος, ὦσδε δ' ὀπώρας and the aromatic plants scattered throughout the poem.

ἔλαια in the sense 'drops of unction' is novel, Σ Ψ ad loc. (II.50.37 Pf.) τὰ ἔλαια πληθυντικῶς παρ' οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ εὕρηται. It is paralleled in the singular with *Il.* 23.186, *Od.* 7.107, *HH* 24.3 (Hestia-statue) αἰεὶ σῶν πλοκάμων ἀπολείβεται ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον. The notion of a greasy aroma could hark back to *Demeter*. Theophr. *De odor.* 26 says that the famous Coan quince-perfume consists of a mixture of olive oil and quince, a recipe valid for most perfumes in antiquity, cf. Theophr.

---

[121] See Lilja 19f., 25f., Richardson 1974, 252, Williams on Call. *HyAp.* 38 and on the perfumed hair of a godhead Gerbeau on Nonn. *D.* 18.351 (add Aphrodite in Virg. *A.* 1.403–4).

[122] Tib. 2.2.5–9, a poem on the birthday of his friend Cornutus, may echo several features appearing in Theoc. 7 (< P.): *ipse suos Genius adsit visurus honores,/cui decorent sanctas mollia serta comas./illius puro destillent tempora nardo,/ille satur libo sit madeatque mero,/adnuat et, Cornute, tibi, quodcumque rogabis.*

op.c. 7f. and see Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 16 on Athena's hated χρίματα μεικτά. Unguent drops falling from the tresses of Demeter would also insinuate the use of olive-oil in the worship of the goddess, see fr. 11. The motif is fittingly reproduced? in Call. as in Cyrenaica in addition to ἐλαῖαι . . κάλλισται καὶ ἔλαιον πλεῖστον (Theophr. *HP* 4.3.1; inscriptions: C. Dobias-Lalou in G. Barker, *al.* (edd.), *Cyrenaica in Antiquity*, Oxford 1985, 176, 178) there were famous perfumes esp. of roses and crocus, cf. Theophr. *HP* 6.6.5, *CP* 6.18.3. Philitan diction, however, seems to be reproduced in *Aet.* fr. 7.12 ἀπ' ὀστ⌋λ̣ι̣⌋γγων δ' αἰὲν ἄλειφα ῥέει of the anointed head of a statue of the Graces in Paros. ἄλειφα is a hapax in Call. and occurs as ἄλειφαρ in Theoc. 7.147 πίθων ἀπελύετο κρατὸς ἄλειφαρ of the head of wine-jars, and in 18.45 of the ritualistic smooth oil for Helen's cult-statue under a shady plane-tree in Sparta. Perhaps it was the word employed of the unguent drops from Demeter's locks. If so, plural ἔλαια in Call. may be meant to be an echo of the Philitan ἄλειφα (in a broader context, as 56–7 echo fr. 19?).

In the elegant 39–40 noticeable is the strong alliteration οὐ *λίπος Ἀπόλλωνος ἀποστάζουσιν* . ./. . . *πανάκειαν* . . . *ᾧ κεν ἐκεῖναι* and the homoeoteleuton ἔθειραι/ἐκεῖναι. Apollo's locks drip οὐ λίπος 'vulgar grease' but αὐτὴν πανάκειαν. Panaceia 'all-curing' is a minor medicinal deity, daughter of Asclepius, and, as a substantive, a name of various plants of medicinal use (Theophr. *HP* 9.11.1–3), see Williams ad loc. (add Virg. *A.* 12.419). Panaceia was worshipped in Cos in association with Asclepius. Herodas 4.5–6 testifies to an altar of hers outside the Coan Asclepieum, which is confirmed by excavations.[123]

In 41 πρῶκες is a Doric word (Greg. Cor. *De dial. Dor.* 93) recurring in Theoc. 4.16, cf. πρώ⌋κ̣ιον in Call. fr. 1.34. ἔραζε 'to the ground' occurs always at the end of the verse except here and [Theoc.] 25.265 (before the caesura). Here it violates Meyer's first law (words of shape x – ⏑ do not end in the second foot), the only other instance in Call. occurring in *HyDem.* 91. Hollis 1990, 19–20 surmised an intention of producing a special effect, cf. Call. *Hec.* fr. 74.5 καὶ κ⌋ρῖμν̣ον⌋ κυκεῶνος ἀπ̣οστάξαντος ἔραζε echoing *HyAp.* 39 and note

---

[123] See Sh-W 347–51. I. C. Cunningham, *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966), 115–7 expressed reservations about the Coan localisation of mimiamb 4, but see Sh-W 350–2, F. Manakidou, *Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der hellenistischen Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1993, 18f. and in general *SEG* 41.688.

that P. violates Meyer's fisrt law in frr. 13.1 and 20.1. ἀκήρια 'unharmed, safe' has a medical colour, cf. Σ Ψ ad loc. (II.50.41 Pf., *q.v.*) ἄνοσα καὶ ἄφθαρτα, and though it should not be confused with ἀκήρατα or ἀκηράσια (Vian on A.R. 4.159), it implies purity. Its medical colour here emanates from the belief of ancient physicians that some unguents were beneficial, whereas others detrimental to health, cf. Athen. 15.675a and see Schneider 1873, 285. Apollo's healing power renders him the pure god *par excellence* (Parker 1983, 393). A cathartic law (*LSS* 115) found in Cyrene and dated to the last quarter of the 4th cent. BC prescribes purificatory restrictions allegedly decreed by Apollo, see Parker 1983, 332–51 with further bibliography. Purity was of exceptional concern to Demeter, the Coans and P. and it will reappear with its poetic symbolism at the end of the Hymn.

In 42–6 the many crafts of Apollo are pointed out: κεῖνος ὀιστευτὴν ἔλαχ' ἀνέρα, κεῖνος ἀοιδόν (43). Chalcon, whom Demeter ἔλαχεν, comprises both qualities. Heracles' bow featured in *Demeter* (fr. 16) and Chalcon probably took him by surprise with his own bow (whence Heracles' φύξα), so as to become an archer (ὀιστευτὴς ἀνήρ) more competent even than Heracles. The bow bears literary connotations in epinician poetry (Nünlist 145f.) and Chalcon, as an allegorical ἀοιδός, may have been involved in proceedings carrying a poetological symbolism such as the welling out of Bourina, perhaps on the advice of Demeter, whence Demeter appeared as a goddess of good poetry in P. With regards to medicine ἐκ δέ νυ Φοίβου/ἰητροὶ δεδάασιν ἀνάβλησιν θανάτοιο (45–6). The reference to ἀνάβλησιν θανάτοιο may exactly correspond to a miraculous treatment of a dying infant performed by the goddess in *Demeter*.

In the passage discussing Apollo *nomios* (47–54) Call. lavishly employs rarities (50 βουβόσιον, 53 ὕπαρνοι), novelties (48 ζευγίτιδας (fem.), 51 ἐπιμηλάδες, 52 ἀγάλακτες) and technical terms (54 μουνοτόκος, διδυματόκος). Vv. 52–3 οὐδ' ἀγάλακτες/οἴιες οὐδ' ἄκυθοι refer to the fecundity of the flocks ᾗσιν 'Απόλλων/βοσκομένῃσ' ὀφθαλμὸν ἐπήγαγεν. Attention to Chalcon's flocks would be expected (see ff.) and milk might had been set out at his rustic banquet, cf. Ov. *F.* 4.545 at Triptolemus' house *mox epulas ponunt, liquefacta coagula lacte*, Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13.10 (~ Theoc. 7, Longus) at a countryside banquet after a sacrifice to the Nymphs featuring γαλάκτια ποικίλα. Particularly striking is a term denoting sterility, 53 (οἴιες) ἄκυθοι (= ἄγονοι), an absolute hapax which Σ PAnt. ad loc. (II.48.7 Pf.) render ἀνέγκυοι,

cf. EtG α 388 . . . ἢ παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν σπέρμα. Claudian says that not only the land, but Ceres too was barren after her first birth, *RP* 1.123–6 *nec tribuit subolem Lucina secundam/fessaque post primos haeserunt viscera partus;/*infecunda *quidem, sed cunctis altior extat/matribus*, cf. Alcimede of Jason in A.R. 1.287–9.

This finds itself in agreement with μουνοτόκος, the epicised form of the technical term μονοτόκος (Arist. *HA* 576a1, *GA* 772b2) used of animals bearing one suckling at a time.[124] It might be introduced into poetry by Call., but it is rather forced of an ewe, as Arist. *HA* 573b19 says that (πρόβατα and αἶγες) τίκτουσιν τὰ μὲν πλεῖστα δύο, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ τρία ἢ τέτταρα. The term would suit Demeter or Persephone as a witty alternative to their traditional attributes, Opp. *Hal.* 3.488–9 κούρην/μουνογόνην, *OrphF* 109, Orph. *Hy.* 29.2 (Persephone) μουνογένεια θεά, 40.16 (Demeter) μουνογενής, Paus. 1.31.4 (Persephone) Πρωτογόνη, Claud. *RP* 1.122–3 *Cereri proles optata . . /unica*, see Hopkinson 1994, 193, *LSJ* s.v. μουνογόνος quoting an inscription of the 2nd cent. BC from Tricca on Persephone and cf. A.R. 3.847 Δαῖραν μουνογένειαν (~ Hes. *Theog.* 448), where the Scholiast confused Hecate with Persephone (λέγει δὲ τὴν Περσεφόνην, ὡς δηλοῖ {διὰ} τὸ μουνογένειαν, 241.5 Wendel). The loss of the only-child is often pointed out in funerary epigrams.[125] Nonn. *D.* 6.31–2 in the sententious μουνοτόκοι γάρ/τηλυγέτους διὰ παῖδας ἀεὶ τρομέουσι τοκῆες of Demeter and *ibid.* 58–9 μουνοτόκου δέ/κούρης of Persephone (passive sense), may not be the first to apply this term to them.

The (οἴιες) ὕπαρνοι may be another verbal loan of Call. from P. A dactylic entry in Hesychius may preserve the original Philitan phrase:

υ 243 ὕπαρνος ποίμνη· ἄρνας ἔχουσα.

Diogenianus may have drawn this citation from a Σ on Call. *HyAp.* 53 οἴιες οὐδ' ἄκυθοι, πᾶσαι δέ κεν εἶεν ὕπαρνοι/. ὕπαρνος first occurs

---

[124] Cf. the Homeric hapax *Il.* 17.5 (heifer) πρωτοτόκος . . οὐ πρὶν εἰδυῖα τόκοιο, Theoc. 5.27 (goat), of women Plato *Theaet.* 151c, *al.*, Nonn. *D.* 9.315, and *At. Gl.* fr. 48 πρόκας· . . . οἷον πρωτοτόκους. διδυματόκος is a quality of Theoc.'s goats (1.25, 2.34, 5.84, 8.45 — cf. Arist. *HA* 573b31 διδυμοτοκοῦσι δὲ καὶ πρόβατα καὶ αἶγες διά τ' εὐβοσίαν, καὶ ἐὰν ὁ κριὸς ἢ ὁ τράγος ᾖ διδυμοτόκος ἢ ἡ μήτηρ) which also Philip *GPh* 15.5 and Long. 2.34.1 appreciated. -τοκος adjj. proliferate in Imperial poetry, see Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 52 ὠμοτόκος.

[125] Cf. e.g. *CEG* 174b.4, c.4 (*c.* 475–450 BC), Call. *Hylal* 108, A.R. 1.99, Leon. Tar. *HE* 71.2, Nicaenet. *HE* 2.3, *GVI* 665.3f., 734.4, 840.3, 857.2, 961.4, 1043a, 1878.3, 2089.5 (3rd cent. BC to 2nd cent. AD), *SEG* 34.274.4 (late Imperial) ὃς ἔπλετο μητέρι μοῦνος, 42.1684.2 (Imperial).

in Eur. *Andr.* 557 (lyr.). The term would befit a scholar-poet: it would vary the Homeric and absolute hapax *Il.* 10.215–6 ὄϊν . . ./θῆλυν ὑπόρρηνον, which is rendered as ὕπαρνον in Apoll. Soph. 160.15, Suid. υ 572, EtM 783.19 ὑπόρρηνον· ὕπαρνον· ῥῆνες γὰρ τὰ πρόβατα (*Σ *Il.* ad loc.). The Callimachean verse seems to toy with the disputed meaning of the Homeric term (ἔγκυον, οἱ δὲ θηλάζουσαν, Σ T ad loc., III.42 Erbse). Flocks may well have appeared in *Demeter*: their wool features in fr. 17 and their possession, as a typical indication of wealth (see fr. 17d), would befit the blessed Coan king. Cos was rich in flocks and Demeter was worshipped in Cos and elsewhere as a goddess of pasture, see fr. 17. Virg. *E.* 9.31 *sic cytiso pastae distendant ubera vaccae*, in a poem apparently reproducing many features of *Demeter*, seems to refer to this detail.

P.'s presence perseveres in 56–7, where the word is of Apollo as founder of cities (*ktistes*), a particular cult of him in Cyrene (Fraser i, 788–9):

> *Φοῖβος γὰρ ἀεὶ πολίεσσι φιληδεῖ*
> κτιζομένῃσ', *αὐτὸς* δὲ *θεμείλια Φοῖβος* ὑφαίνει.

These lines echo fr. 19 about the foundation of Phlious:

> *Φλιοῦς γὰρ πόλις ἐστὶ* Διωνύσου *φίλος* υἱός
> Φλιοῦς *ἥν αὐτὸς δείματο λευκολόφος.*

P.'s δείματο is rendered with θεμείλια . . ὑφαίνει, cf. /δείματο just following in 62. For a possible Philitan ὑφαίνω, cf. Theoc. 7.8 (poplars and elms around Bourina) εὔσκιον ἄλσος ὕφαινον. In 58 (Apollo) τετραέτης extends Homeric *Od.* 2.106, *al.* τρίετες etc. but it is feeble if it is meant to emulate P.'s conceivable τετράενος. In 72 Σπάρτη . . . πρώτιστον ἔδεθλον the term ἔδεθλον (cf. 62 ἐδέθλια of infant Apollo's constructions), a term "di uso esclusivamente alessandrino" (Livrea on A.R. 4.331) is first used in the sense 'shrine' by Antim. fr. 33.2 (Ladon) Δήμητρος . . . Ἐρινύος . . ἔδεθλον (secular in Aesch. *Ag.* 776 (conj.)), as is the meaning here. See Hollis 1990, 359 on the possibly Callimachean Suid. ε 204 ἔδεθλον· ἔδρασμα.

Traces of *Od.* 7.117–21 (Alcinous' garden), on which fr. 9 is modelled and which, to judge by some of the flora in Theoc. 7, perhaps exerted a broader influence on a certain passage in *Demeter* (Chalcon's garden?), first occur in 78 with τελεσφορίην [a Cyrenean word] ἐπετήσιον and mostly in 80–3:

ἰὴ ἰὴ Καρνεῖε πολύλλιτε, σεῖο δὲ βωμοί
ἄνθεα μὲν φορέουσιν ἐν εἴαρι τόσσα περ Ὧραι
ποικίλ' ἀγινεῦσι ζεφύρου πνείοντος ἐέρσην,
χείματι δὲ κρόκον ἡδύν.

For unHomeric εἴαρι (though cf. *Il.* 2.89, *al.*, then e.g. A.R. 4.961 εἰαρινός) cf. Theoc. 7.97. It is a favourite form in Hellenistic poetry.[126] Early epic knows only ἔαρι (West on Hes. *WD* 462). Ὧραι are associated with Apollo ὡρίτης (Lyc. 352 and *LSJ Suppl.* s.v. Ὡρείτης), as well as with Demeter ὡρηφόρος, see fr. 10.2c. The verses influenced Nic. *Alex.* *232–3 (apples) τοῖά περ ὧραι/εἰαριναὶ φορέουσιν ἐνεψιήματα κούραις. Their parallelism with Philetas' description of his garden in Long. 2.3.3 may elucidate their background: (κῆπος) ὃν . . . ἐξεπονησάμην, ὅσα ὧραι φέρουσι, πάντα ἔχων ἐν αὐτῷ καθ' ὥραν ἑκάστην followed by a list of flowers and fruits. V. 83 ζεφύρου πνείοντος (: -ντας *v.l.*) is in accordance with an Aristarchan reading in *Od.* 4.567, see Rengakos 1993, 100.

Zephyrus εὐδιεινὸς καὶ ἥδιστος (Arist. *Prob.* 943b21, *al.*) is a mild, refreshing wind blowing only in spring or autumn at evening time.[127] It can be part of an ideal landscape, cf. in the Elysian Fields *Od.* 4.567 (~ *EG* 1046.22 Kaibel, *c.* 161 AD) ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνείοντος (see Schönbeck 57–9), and it often appears around springs, cf. Leon. Tar. *HE* 85.2, Hermocr. *HE* 1.1–2 ἵζευ ὑπὸ σκιερὰν πλάτανον . . ./ἇς ἁπαλῷ Ζέφυρος πνεύματι φύλλα δονεῖ, Nicaenet. *HE* 4.2, 'Plato' *FGE* 17.2, Anon. *FGE* 74.3, 78.2, Satyrus *FGE* 3.3. Significantly, Zephyrus blows as a wind of vegetation in Alcinous' garden in the influential *Od.* 7.118–9 ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἰεί/ζεφυρίη πνείουσα τὰ μὲν φύει, ἄλλα δὲ πέσσει. Its ripening power links it to Demeter, cf., in a hymn to Demeter, Theoc. 10.47 (ἐς) ζέφυρον βλεπέτω· πιαίνεται ὁ στάχυς οὕτως, then 'Bacch.' *FGE* 1.2 τῷ πάντων ἀνέμων πιοτάτῳ Ζεφύρῳ, Call. fr. 110.53 θῆλυς ἀήτης, Satyrus *FGE* 1.1, Long. 3.12.2 (ἄνθη) ἄρτι ὁ ζέφυρος τρέφων, Nonn. *D.* 3.10 Ζεφύροιο προάγγελος ἔγκυος

---

[126] Cf. also Theoc. 12.30, [23].29, Leon. Tar. *HE* 19.7, Zenod. *HE* 3.3, Alex. Aet. *CA* 1.2, Antig. Car. *SH* 47.1, Nic. *Ther.* 32, 74, *Alex.* 569, Bion fr. 2.17, cf. εἴαρος in Theoc. 13.26, Arat. 514, Euph. *CA* 40.3, Bion 2.1, 17, εἶαρ in Nic. *Alex.* 577, Num. Her. *SH* 582.2, Bion fr. 2.15.

[127] Mildness: Arist. *Prob.* 946a17, Theophr. *De ventis* 38 λειότατος τῶν ἀνέμων, in poetry *Il.* 19.415–6, Philoxen. *PMG* 835, A.R. 4.768, 821, Diosc. *HE* 11.2. Blowing in spring or autumn: Arist. *op.c.* 943b28 πνεῖ ἔαρος μάλιστα, 946a18–9, Theophr. *op.c.* 38, see N-H on Hor. *C.* 1.4.1, Vian on Nonn. *D.* 3.11. Blowing in the evening: Arist. *op.c.* 944a10, 946a19 πρὸς ἑσπέραν τῆς ἡμέρας, Theophr. *op.c.* 41, 47.

Ὥρῃ, *ibid.* 31.110, Orion Theb. 66 > EtGud. 230.35 Sturz (~ EtM 408.43) Ζέφυρος· παρὰ τὸ ζωοφόρος εἶναι. τρέφει γὰρ τοὺς καρπούς. . . . τῷ γὰρ θέρει πνέοντι αὐτῷ οἱ καρποὶ αὔξονται, Cat. 64.282 *aura aperit flores tepidi fecunda Favoni*, Servius on Virg. *G.* 1.43. As the wind traditionally most suitable for winnowing chaff from grain (cf. 'Bacch.' *l.c.*, Virg. *G.* 1.134), it is early linked to Demeter who supervises this activity, cf. *Il.* 5.499f. ὡς δ' ἄνεμος ἄχνας φορέει ἱερὰς κατ' ἀλωάς/ ἀνδρῶν λικμώντων, ὅτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ/κρίνῃ ἐπειγομένων ἀνέμων καρπόν τε καὶ ἄχνας etc., see West on Hes. *WD* 599. Its procreative power is miraculously extended to the animals as well, see R. Böker, *RE* VIIIA.2323–25 s.v. Winde. In Call. it occurs only here and is attested as used in fr. 615 to account for the name of the Epizephyrian Locrians. Given this literary background, Demeter's withdrawal, Zephyrus' association with her, its ripening powers and its evening blowing, this wind might have been summoned to benefit vegetation and to refresh the interlocutors in the *locus amoenus*.[128]

χείματι in 83 is emphatic. It might be a *correctio* if saffron occurred in P.'s spring. Crocus is a flower *par excellence* associated with Demeter and Persephone, cf. *HHD* 6 with Richardson ad loc., Soph. *OC* 684. It appears around tombs in *GVI* 1363.4 (Astypalaia, 1st cent. BC), 2005.3 (1st/2nd cent. BC). It blossoms in autumn or winter (Theophr. *HP* 6.8.3, 6.10, Nic. fr. 74.56 κρόκος εἴαρι μύων), but often figures with spring flowers as a literary convention, see Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 68. Here it is aptly taken up since it flowers in Cyrene (Theophr. *HP* 4.3.1 κρόκον πολὺν ἡ χώρα φέρει καὶ εὔοσμον), but is not brought into connection with Apollo or used by Call. elsewhere. The best crocus was thought to be the Corycian one (Pliny *NH* 21.31, Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.68). From Call. it is taken up by Prop. 4.6.74 (~ T. 23f) *perluat et nostras spica Cilissa comas.*

In 83–4 a reference to Apollo's perpetual fire at Cyrene comes up (ἀέναον πῦρ/, varying Homeric ἀκάματον πῦρ/). Demeter's cult very much involved fire and a hearth may have figured in *Demeter* at the banqueting-scene, cf. Theoc. 7.66 (Lycidas) πὰρ πυρὶ κεκλιμένος, κύαμον δέ τις ἐν πυρὶ φρυξεῖ and see pp. 210f., 255.

---

[128] Philic. *SH* 680.21 φυσή]μασι θέρμη δ' ἐπέκαεν ἀ[γρούς (suppl. Körte, Gallavotti) and Ov. *Met.* 5.482–4 *primis segetes moriuntur in herbis,/et modo sol nimius, nimius modo corripit imber,/sideraque ventique nocent* follow a version in which the winds are deployed to harm the crops. The blowing of Zephyrus to the opposite effect would constitute an antithesis, see fr. 6 *ad fin.* on a version of Demeter preventing springs from flowing.

In 85–96 the lion's ravage and the settlement of the Dorians at Eurypylean Cyrene may be adapted from the advent of Heracles and the Heraclidae on Eurypylean Cos (fr. 16). In 85–7 ἦ ῥ' ἐχάρη μέγα Φοῖβος, ὅτε ζωστῆρες Ἐνυοῦς/ἀνέρες ὠρχήσαντο μετὰ ξανθῇσι Λιβύσσης/τέθμιαι εὖτέ σφιν Καρνειάδες ἤλυθον ὧραι, Apollo's joy at the virile dance during the first celebration of Carneia in Cyrene may glance at Demeter's similar attitude towards a mimetic dance at Chalcon's feast, which was the first celebration of her cult in Cos. The description of the Dorian colonists of Cyrene as warriors has never been accounted for, but it might allude to the armed retainers of Heracles who landed on Cos as pirates and finally ended up mixing in peace with the Thessalian aboriginals: Heracles himself 'married' the daughter of king Eurypylus, Chalciope.

Vv. 90–2 τοὺς μὲν ἄναξ ἴδεν αὐτός, ἑῇ δ' ἐπεδείξατο νύμφῃ/στὰς ἐπὶ Μυρτούσσης κερατώδεος, ἧχι λέοντα/Ὑψηὶς κατέπεφνε βοῶν σίνιν Εὐρυπύλοιο might allude to *Demeter* too. Chalcon, from an elevated point (from *Βού*-ρινα? Cf. στὰς ἐπὶ Μυρτούσσης *κερατώδεος*), perhaps saw the plainland of Pyxa, where Heracles was forced to flee, and proudly showed (ἐπεδείξατο) the heroic place to Demeter. That Heracles in Call. may be assimilated to a beast (here a lion) falls within tradition. Note that Cyrene's killing of the lion is here conveniently transferred from Thessaly to Cyrene. Then the mutual bond of Apollo and Cyrene is emphasised. The Battiads honoured Apollo as no other god, while Apollo in 94–5 οὐδὲ πόλει τόσ' ἔνειμεν ὀφέλσιμα, τόσσα Κυρήνῃ,/*μνωόμενος προτέρης ἁρπακτύος*. This looks like Demeter benefiting the Coans while being mindful of her daughter's abduction. Note the double sense of μνωόμενος 'be mindful of' or 'woo'.

The game is given away only at the coda of the poem, but the knowledgeable reader would not be surprised. That section may correspond to a similar one at the end of *Demeter*, in which P. pronounced literary declarations in a polemic form, 105–12:

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὔατα λάθριος εἶπεν·
106 'οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει.'
τὸν Φθόνον ὡπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὧδέ τ' ἔειπεν·
''Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλά
λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει.
110 Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.'

Apollo, among his other capacities, is the patron of poetry (O. Falter, *Der Dichter und sein Gott*, Würzburg 1938, 51–2). Even more so in Call. whose alliance with Apollo is prescribed by his Cyrenean origin. Apollo is indeed invoked at crucial moments, *Aet.* fr. 1.21, here, *Iambi* 13 fr. 203.1. Apollo is not the broker of any sort of poetry. He only patronises 'good' poetry: ὡπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται, ἀλλ' ὅτις ἐσθλός. So, the Hymn ends with polemics over poetics. P. tends to come up in such passages.

Phthonus employs in 106 the πόντος-image, which is contrasted with Apollo/Demeter's trickle-image in 112. In Phthonus' οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει, the roaring of the sea has a derogatory tinge, representing the cyclic poets (see Wimmel 1960, 222–5). This might allude to the stillness of the vast sea before Demeter (possibly referred to in *HyAp.* 18 εὐφημεῖ καὶ πόντος) as contrasted to the babble of a small spring, cf. the allitteration of -ρ- in 111–2 καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει/πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς . . . ἄκρον ἄωτον ~ fr. 6, fr. 7 νήχυτον ὕδωρ and Theoc. 7.136–7 τὸ δ' . . ἱερὸν ὕδωρ/. . . κατειβόμενον κελάρυζε. Sounds play an important part in Callimachean aesthetics, cf. in the *Aetia*-prologue (already in the first verse ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀιοιδῇ), esp. 19 denouncing μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδήν, 29–30 (Call. ranking himself among those poets who) λιγὺν ἦχον/τέττιγος, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων and see O. Nikitinski, *ZPE* 122 (1998), 43. The connotations of this image constitute an unmistakable reply to questions related to size. Call.'s reaction is more explicit and more vigorous in his reply to the Telchines reported as με]μφομ(έν)ο[ι]ς αὐτοῦ τὸ κάτισ|χνον τῶν ποιη]μάτ(ων) κ(αὶ) ὅτι οὐχὶ μῆκος ηρα[(Σ Flor., p. 3 Pf.). P. is adduced there too (T. 7) as an example of quality's victory over length.

Apollo rejects the huge and sluggish flow of the Euphrates carrying along much dirt. λύματα occurs also in *HyDem.* 115 ἔκβολα [only here in Call.] λύματα δαιτός of Erysichthon, who impersonates a poetic metaphor too, and cf. the pontic/poetic image in *ibid.* 89–90 τὰ δ' ἐς βυθὸν οἷα θαλάσσας/ἀλεμάτως ἀχάριστα κατέρρεεν εἴδατα πάντα. Chalcon and Demeter may have approached a sea-shore during their Coan tour. The respite of a cathartic bathe would be welcome during their tiresome itinerary, cf. how Odysseus and Diomedes in *Il.* 10.572f., after their expedition, ἱδρῶ πολλὸν ἀπεννίζοντο, θαλάσσῃ/ἐσβάντες . . ./. . ./. . . καὶ ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ and see Kirk on *Il.* 1.314. Theoc.'s misplaced 7.53–4 ὑγρὰ . . κύματα, 57 τὰ κύματα τάν τε θάλασσαν may be of relevance here. So may be Call.'s

ironic hint, repeated twice, at the subversion of traditional features of the myth in *HyDem.* 12 = 16 καὶ οὐ φάγες οὐδὲ λοέσσα. Note also the cult of Demeter Λουσία in Telphousa (Arcadia) ἐπὶ τῷ λούσασθαι τῷ Λάδωνι, Paus. 8.25.6. This would constitute an aetium accounting for a Coan procession corresponding to the Attic ἅλαδε ἔλασις taking place for purificatory purposes three days before the grand procession to Eleusis, cf. Philic. *SH* 680.37, *q.v.* τὸμ παρὰ κῦμα νήστην. In Cos, according to *HG* 8iii.b.25–6 (3rd cent. BC), if Demeter's shrine is defiled, the law ordains ἐξαγέτω ἁ ἱέρεια Κοροτρόφον κατὰ τὰ νομι[ζ]ό|[μενα ἐπὶ θάλασσαν καὶ θυέτω ὗ]ν ἢ ὄιν Κοροτρόφῳ.[129] The term λύματα is an Iliadic dis legomenon which is apposite in a context of bathe, as ancient grammarians associated it with λούω (see van der Valk (I.169) on Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 108.24f.) surely due to Hera's bath in *Il.* 14.170–1 ἀμβροσίῃ . . . ἀπὸ χροὸς ἱμερόεντος/ λύματα πάντα κάθηρεν. It is in most cases "a strong word, not simply 'leavings', but 'refuse', 'filth'", Hopkinson ad loc. (for "Orph. *L.* 586" read "Orph. *L.* 591") and it often conveys the notion of miasma. In this perspective the dirt of the huge Euphrates becomes clearer: it would seem to allude to the filth that Demeter (and Chalcon?) washed away in the sea. The contrast of dirt and purity conveys an apparent literary symbolism.

Prop. T. 23c.8 *exactus tenui pumice versus erat* may be indebted to a lost passage of Call. (could *tenui* suggest T. 6, to which Prop. T. 23a seems to refer?) employing a symbolism of pumice which might originate in its possible appearance in P. as a means of rubbing oneself in a bath (see on this ancient usage K-A on Ar. fr. 332.4). Pumice abounds in volcanic areas and it would not be hard to find in Cos. Theophr. *De lap.* 21 and Pliny *NH* 36.154 say that the best quality comes from, among others, Nisyros. The metaphor would be particularly apposite in view of the pumice's usefulness for smoothing the surface of a book roll. Cat. 1.1–2 *lepidum novum libellum/ arida modo pumice expolitum* employs the motif in association with *leptotes.* Then pumice appears in the very poetic grottoes in Prop. T. 23d.27–8

[129] Herzog's supplement here relies on a common practice documented in *ARW* 10 (1907), 412 n. 2, see also Ginouvès 283–98 and cf. in Cos *LSCG* 151B.23–4 = *HG* 1B.23–4 (4th cent. BC; sacrifice to Athena) θύει ἱ̣α̣ρ̣ε̣ὺ̣ς κ̣α̣ὶ̣ ἀ̣πορρ̣αίνεται θαλ|άσσ̣α̣. On ἅλαδε ἔλασις see Deubner 72, Burkert 1983, 258 n. 9. On seawater as a cathartic agent see Nilsson 1967, 103, Parker 1983, 226–7, 283 (Eleusinian mysteries).

pendebantque cavis tympana pumicibus,/orgia Musarum and in Ov. *Am.* 3.1.3 *speluncaque pumice pendens.* For further Demeter-vocabulary in this line note that before this passage συρφετόν occurs in poetry only in Hes. *WD* 606 as 'chuff (left over after threshing)'.

What is best, decrees Apollo, is the small pure drop that the bees carry for the sake of Deo (cf. Ov. *F.* 4.412 *parva bonae Cereri, sint modo casta, placent*). The contrast of a river with a pure spring is implied in Apollo's address to Propertius in T. 23d.15 *quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine?* in circumstances strongly reminding those postulated for P. Vv. 110–2 may reproduce an image from *Demeter* in which bees buzz around Bourina. The very same image is reproduced in Theoc. 7.142 πωτῶντο ξουθαὶ περὶ πίδακας ἀμφὶ μέλισσαι. Δηοῖ alludes to the model. καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος places emphasis on purity. ἀχράαντος is "a decidedly sombre word" which has a religious touch and often implies sexual chastity, see Campbell on Mosch. *Eur.* 73. It is a novel form of the common epic ἄχραντος modelled on Homeric ἀκράαντος.

πίδαξ is a term very possibly of Philitan provenance. It is a Homeric hapax (*Il.* 16.825 πίδακος ἀμφ' ὀλίγης) and it is used by Call. here and by Theoc. 7.142 in the same context and in the only occurrence in either. ἱερῆς, replacing Homeric ὀλίγης, may depict the divine ambience in the Philitan scenery, cf. Theoc. 7.136 ἱερὸν ὕδωρ. ὀλίγης is reserved to apply to λιβάδος, as in A.R. 4.1454 (flies) ἀμφ' ὀλίγην μέλιτος γλυκεροῦ λίβα.[130] πίδαξ specifically applies to a natural source which, as Bourina (see fr. 6c), often springs out of a rock, cf. A.R. 4.1456 πετραίῃ περὶ πίδακι ~ Q.S. 3.578–9, Leon. Tar. *HE* 3.1–2 Νυμφέων ἱερὸς πάγος αἵ θ' ὑπὸ πέτρῃ/πίδακες whence Anon. *FGE* 73.1–2, Nonn. *D.* 32.295, 45.309–10, and cf. Call. fr. 67.12 πιδυλίδα rendered by Hsch. π 2163 as πέτρα ἐξ ἧς ὕδωρ ῥέει and for the imagery Nicias *HE* 5.1–2 ἵζευ ὑπ' αἰγείροισιν . . . ὀδῖτα,/καὶ πῖθ' ἆσσον ἰὼν πίδακος ἁμετέρας. The association of the word in its early occurrences with Nymphs may well be due to P.[131]

---

[130] λιβάς may be the term used of Hesiod's drinking from Hippocrene in the original *Aetia*-prologue, as it comes up in what seem to be two independent echoes of that passage, Alc. Mess. *HE* 12.6 καθαρῶν γευσάμενος λιβάδων, Honest. *GPh* 5.1–2 ἐκορέσθης/Πηγασίδος κρήνης νεκταρέων λιβάδων.

[131] πίδαξ is popular with the Hellenistic poets, but its occurrences might all follow the same path. Call., Theoc. and probably Nicias depend on P. Its occurrence in Anyte *HE* 18.3 may be relevant here, esp. if that epigram employs programmatic images (Gutzwiller 1998, 73) which first appeared in P. The term is associated

Two distinct layers make up the imagery of this passage: the water, and the bee image. Puelma 1960, 156 n. 38 (cf. also Gutzwiller 1998, 73) inferred from Prop. Tt. 23c, d that P. used the water-motif in a "programmatisch wichtige Stelle". Müller 1987, 41–2 attributed the symbolism of both water and bees to P. They may well be right. Both the water-image and the bee-image of poetry originate in Pindar.[132] Call.'s knowledge of the Pindaric background becomes evident by the employment of ἄκρον ἄωτον in 112; so does the presence of P. with the reference to Deo.

With regard to bees, Williams on v. 110 has demonstrated that 110–2 can be read equally satisfactorily in three different ways: a. the physical: bees as actual bees, b. the religious: bees insinuating 'devotees of Demeter' and c. the poetic: bees as poets. Any insistence on one at the expense of another is pointless, see also C. Calame in Harder 1993, 52–4. All notions may have been insinuated in *Demeter* with the appearance of Melissai ὀροδεμνιάδες. It would also seem that P. meant his images to convey their poetological symbolism. Would he ignore their implications? If he began his poem (fr. 5a) with a reference to Pind. *Hymn to Persephone* fr. 37, he might have alluded to him in other parts of his poem too (at its end?). Besides, the poetic bee is not a favourite symbolism of Call.: these are the untrodden path and water, both derived from Pindar. Bees appear in Theoc. 7 in relation to poetry and their association with proverbial industry (cf. Arist. *HA* 625b18, *GA* 759a8–761a1, Hes. *Theog.* 594f., *WD* 304–6, Pind. *P.* 6.53) would appeal to P.'s erudite poetic dogma.

With regard to water, in *Demeter* νήχυτον ὕδωρ (fr. 7) had seemingly flown from Bourina, which thanks to Demeter may have been

with Nymphs in Theoc. and Leon. Tar. *ll.cc.*, Hermocr. *HE* 2.2, A.R. 4.1394, 1451, 1456 (in the garden of the Hesperid Nymphs, see Livrea on 4.1451, Kyriakou 210–1), and later in Alciphr. *Epist.* 4.13.11. It is absent from bucolic other than the one (Philitan) occurrence in Theoc. It becomes more popular later: Apollonid. *GPh* 2.4, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 70.4, Sabinus *GPh* 2.4, Leon. Alex. *FGE* 33.1, Anon. *GDRK* 16.11, Anon. *AP* 9.585.2, Q.S. 4x, [Opp.] *Cyn.* 3x, Orph. *Lith.* 369, Orph. *Hy.* 11.8, Nonn. *D.* 9x, Orph. *Arg.* 598, Joann. Gaz. 2.136. Crinag. *GPh* 43.1 coins the absolute hapax εὐπίδακες.

[132] On the water-image see in general Wimmel 1960, 222f., Kambylis 113f., Cameron 1995, 363–6 and in particular M. Poliakoff, "Nectar, springs and the sea: critical terminology in Pindar and Callimachus", *ZPE* 39 (1980), 41–7, Asper 109f. On the bee-image cf. Pind. *P.* 10.53–4, then Plato *Ion* 534a–b and see N. J. Richardson, "Pindar and Later Literary Criticism", *PLLS* 5 (1985), 391–2, Nünlist 60f. In general see Kambylis 98f., G-P on Leon. Tar. 98.1, Davies-Kathirithamby 70–2, G. Crane, *AJPh* 108 (1987), 400–2.

pure and sacred. A similar kind of water runs from the cave of the Nymphs in Theoc. 7.136–7, which is prefigured in 6–7 with a reference to Bourina itself. Crucially, Call. makes a quantitative addition in 112. From the pure and sacred source an ὀλίγη λιβάς 'small trickle' would suffice, cf. the cicada's δρόσον in *Aet.* fr. 1.33 and note that the 'Philitan water' in Prop. T. 23d.51–2 is contrasted to the *magnis*. . *fontibus* of Ennius in v. 5 of that elegy. Pind. *I.* 7.18–9 ὅ τι μὴ σοφίας ἄωτον ἄκρον/κλυταῖς ἐπέων ῥοαῖσιν ἐξίκηται ζυγέν first made the point, but λιβάς is carefully chosen to be unPindaric. The water-imagery in Prop. Tt. 23c.6 *quamque bibistis aquam?* and in *id.* 23d.52 (Calliope) *ora Philitea nostra rigavit aqua* shows that the Roman knew that in the passages of Call. lurk images from P. As it seems, a tripartition of the concluding verse does justice to the two contributors to the passage: πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς (P.)| ὀλίγη λιβάς (Call.)| ἄκρον ἄωτον (Pind.).

IIIb2. *Callimachus*, Hymn to Demeter

Emulation with P. takes a different form in *HyDem.* The Coan's influence has been suspected on vague premises but no specific links have been traced.[133] Direct references to P. seem to be restricted to the essentials. Three passages are of particular interest in this respect. The section recapitulating traditional features of the myth (6–23), the description of Demeter's grove (24–38) and the features of Demeter's appearance as a priestess (42–4). The introductory 1–6 set up the illusionary cultic context; women are waiting for a sacred κάλαθος to arrive after a procession (cf. fr. 17). In the next verses Call. selects memorable features of the traditional Demeter-myth blending them with playful witticism. A reference to Hesperus comes first in 7–9:

> Ἕσπερος ἐκ νεφέων ἐσκέψατο (πανίκα νεῖται;),
> Ἕσπερος, ὅς τε πιεῖν Δαμάτερα μῶνος ἔπεισεν
> ἁρπαγίμας ὅκ' ἄπυστα μετέστιχεν ἴχνια κώρας.

Demeter may have arrived at Chalcon's palace at the time when Hesperus appears, which by convention heralds the time to return

[133] Cf. e.g. Bowie 80 n. 58: "Callimachus' own *Hymn to Demeter* . . . should owe something to *Demeter* too" or M. Haslam in Harder 1993, 119 n. 14: "If we had Philetas' *Demeter* the poem would no doubt become more complex still". For Müller's suggestions see ff.

home, cf. *Od.* 1.422f., Sappho fr. 104a, A.R. 3.1138f., and is the usual time for the wandering god to arrive at his host (Hollis 1990, 341f.). Hesperus is the star designating the end of the day's labours (Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 177.5–6, Hopkinson on *HyDem.* 7). Consequently, the house-maidens carry baskets filled with wool (fr. 17), as their wool-working comes to an end, cf. Call. *Hec.* fr. 18.6 (wool-working girls) δειελὸν αἰτίζιουσιν, ἄγουσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀπ' ἔργου. Hesperus might be involved in an aetium accounting for the Thesmophoric break of fasting in the evening, when the star appears, cf. Ov. *F.* 4.535–6 *quae quia principio posuit ieiunia noctis,/tempus habent mystae sidera visa cibi.* In Ovid the goddess eats a poppy-seed as she enters Celeus' hut, cf. also the inversion of this motif in *Met.* 5.440–1 *illam non udis veniens Aurora capillis/cessantem vidit, non Hesperus.* Hesperus' traditional association with release from labour and with the time for an evening-meal (*Il.* 11.86, *Od.* 13.31f., Call. *Hec. l.c.*, A.R. 1.1172f.) would make it easier for the goddess to break her fast. Theoc. 7.53 Ἔριφοι ἑσπέριοι may be of relevance here.[134] This would be another innovation of P. and Call.'s comment does not fall short of witticism: it was not Iambe, nor Baubo nor anyone else that earlier treatments might have adduced, who persuaded Demeter to drink; it was none other (μῶνος) than Hesperus, i.e. her own late evening fatigue.

The endless, boring repetition of traditional motifs is treated with apparent irony, 12–6:

οὐ πίες οὔτ' ἄρ' ἔδες τῆνον χρόνον οὐδὲ λοέσσα.
τρὶς μὲν δὴ διέβας Ἀχελώιον ἀργυροδίναν,
τοσσάκι δ' ἀενάων ποταμῶν ἐπέρασας ἕκαστον,
τρὶς δ' ἐπὶ Καλλιχόρῳ χαμάδις ἐκαθίσσαο φρητί
αὐσταλέα ἄποτός τε καὶ οὐ φάγες οὐδὲ λοέσσα.

Here Demeter is said to repeatedly cross rivers and rest at springs but, albeit very thirsty, to have never indulged in a break of her fast. The break of fast and the bathing of Demeter may have been two prominent features in P.'s treatment and, although Call. may know of other such breaks as well, these references may be directed mainly against his version. τρὶς . . ./τοσσάκι . . ./τρίς and the immediate resumption of the fasting-motif neatly expresses the abuse of

[134] Theoc. 7.52–3 mentioning Eriphoi and Orion in Lycidas' song might suggest that in *Demeter* there was word of celestial phenomena. Kidd 40 would regard Ἔριφοι ἑσπέριοι as an imitation of Arat. 1065–66 ἑσπερίων . . /Πληιάδων.

traditional motifs. In a highly ironic manner, Call. summons his listeners to show fitting respect. After all, such an overtreatment is not pleasing to the goddess: quest for innovation brought her to tears, 17 μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμες ἃ δάκρυον ἄγαγε Δηοῖ. This verse may specifically refer to P., see fr. 12. The passage reviewing the dismissible trivial themes may open and end with poignant references to P. These would give him a distinguished place but would clearly classify his version as another treatment of the worn-out old story.

The poet will now proceed to suggest alternative themes about Demeter, introduced with a triple κάλλιον corresponding to the triple τρίς of the traditional motifs: Demeter as goddess of ordinances, Demeter bestowing upon Triptolemus the art of cultivating cereals.[135] With the third κάλλιον Call. arrives at his subject: the punishment of Erysichthon. Demeter, in her novel capacity as a goddess of poetry, has the authority to bless Call.'s innovative theme, 29–30 θεὰ δ' ἐπεμαίνετο χώρῳ/ὅσσον Ἐλευσῖνι, Τριόπᾳ θ' ὅσον ὀκκόσον Ἔννᾳ. The goddess' unreserved approval of the novel treatment is demonstrated by her fascination with the novel ambience in which Call. places her. The motif was then employed by Virg. *E.* 6.29–30 (at Silenus' cave) *nec tantum Phoebo gaudet Parnasia rupes,/nec tantum Rhodope miratur et Ismarus Orphea*, cf. Prop. 4.6.12 *res est, Calliope, digna favore tuo.*

In 24f. the poet embarks upon his select subject. The Pelasgians had established for Demeter καλὸν ἄλσος . . ./δένδρεσιν ἀμφιλαφές. This last word recurs in passages with Philitan overtones. All the trees in this grove occur also in Theoc. 7 and perhaps go back to P.: elms, pear-trees, apples and a poplar associated with Nymphs are aptly taken up as ominous trees. πίτυς in 27, the only tree in the singular (Elliger 301), is a remarkable exception. Pine-trees are a stock-feature in ideal localities and they are commonly related to death and lamentation.[136] Steph. Byz. 452.9 s.v. Μίλητος says that its twigs were used as *stibades* in the local Thesmophoria, but the

[135] Müller 1987, 42 thought that it is the themes of 18–21 that are complimentarily taken up from P. Things may in fact be the other way round. R. Hunter's view (*MD* 29 (1992), 10) that "7–17 of Hymn 6 represent a small-scale rewriting of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*" is sweepingly simplistic. P. Bing, *SyllClass* 6 (1995), 29f. pointed out Call.'s distancing from the *HHD* and — quite rightly, I think — took it as denoting a literary stance.

[136] Cf. *Il.* 13.390 = 16.483, Simon. *IEG* 11.2, Theoc. 1.134, Euph. *CA* 84.1, Nic. *Alex.* 300–1, Nonn. *D.* 12.134. Odysseus sees one as an ominous sign in the yard of Cyclops in *Od.* 9.186.

information is isolated.[137] πίτυς, πεύκη and ἐλάτη belong to the same family of trees and are discussed successively in one chapter in Theophr. *HP* 3.9. One was often mistaken for the other and Theophr. *HP* 3.9.4 elaborately tries to distinguish πεύκη from πίτυς. Murr 111 noted that πίτυς is a collective term for all coniferous trees, later replaced by πεύκη. These trees were mostly associated with orgiastic cults. The torches carried by Demeter in *HHD* 48 are of such character (see Richardson ad loc.) and a πεύκη is mentioned in Philic. *SH* 680.50]υ πεύκας ἀνελοῦ, λῦε βαρεῖαν ὀφρύν, cf. *ibid.* 6]λαμπάδας υλ̣ηδ̣ [, and Pampr. 3.120 θυόεσσαν Ἐλευσινίης φλόγα πεύκης, which becomes explicitly a pine in Ov. *F.* 4.493–4 *accendit geminas pro lampade pinus:/hinc Cereris sacris nunc quoque taeda datur* and *id. Met.* 441–3. Torches may have been lit in *Demeter* in the palace-feast in the context of piping, see fr. 20. Call. may have taken this element up to undermine the peacefulness of the locality. Such an interpretation is in line with other indications from this passage. The batch of armed retainers of Erysichthon rushing (36 ἔδραμον) into the grove and striking a poplar to cut it down and the latent 'violent' vocabulary of 28–9 τὸ δ' . . . ὕδωρ/ἐξ ἀμαρᾶν *ἀνέθυε* ['boiled up']. θεὰ δ' *ἐπεμαίνετο* χώρῳ (see Hopkinson 1984, 5, Kyriakou 226) apparently have an orgiastic background. Dionysus' anger in 70–1 καὶ γὰρ τᾷ Δάματρι συνωργίσθη Διόνυσος·/τόσσα Διώνυσον γὰρ ἃ καὶ Δάματρα χαλέπτει would gain a special meaning.

In 42–4 Demeter disguises herself as the public priestess of the city in order to dissuade Erysichthon, γέντο δὲ χειρί/στέμματα καὶ μάκωνα, κατωμαδίαν δ' ἔχε κλᾷδα. This is a 'cultic' transformation in contrast to *HHD* 91f. where Demeter took the secular guise of an old woman. For στ. καὶ μάκ. cf. Theoc. 7.157 δράγματα καὶ μάκωνας. The expression might be related to the public priestess of Demeter in Cos and her Thessalian origin. The term κληῖδες is rendered in Hsch. κ 2954 as παρὰ Ἐφεσίοις τῆς θεοῦ τὰ στέμματα and could find an application here as 'sacred garment'. Hopkinson goes for 'keys' (of priests as official key-holders see Burkert 1985, 97), which looks likely in Call., but the usage is ambiguous and might

---

[137] In Miletus, formerly called Pityousa ὅτι ἐκεῖ πρῶτον πίτυς ἔφυ, the use of pine-trees in the Thesmophoria is due to restrictively local reasons, διὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς γεννέσεως, Steph. Byz. *l.c.* In the Asclepius-temple of Epidaurus (m. 5th cent. BC) the god holds a branch of pine on the basis of which C. Benedum, *JDAI* 101 (1986), 144 n. 44 proposed to establish an association with Demeter via medicine.

toy with a different employment of this term. κατωμαδίαν is a detail which might speak for a garment of Demeter, see p. 227.

The Coan's presence does not exhaust itself in loans of scattered motifs, vocabulary and flora. This time P. exerted a more 'fundamental' impact. Call., it seems, conceived his own poem and *Demeter* as a contrasting pair. The subject of Call.'s poem is not only chosen from the 'Coan' Hes. *Cat.* fr. 43a.2f., but concerns the very same family in Cos (Kyriakou 228–9). Erysichthon's daughter Mestra bore Eurypylus on Cos (Hes. *Cat.* fr. 43a.55–9). Eurypylus was the father of Chalcon and Antagoras, who, in their turn, were the ancestors of Phrasidamus and Antigenes in Theoc. 7.3f. As Call. credits Erysichthon with a crime against Demeter which tradition attributed to his father Triopas (see ff.), he seems to take aim at Erysichthon's descendants who hosted Demeter in exemplary fashion in P.'s poem. So he clearly puts Cos and P. into his subversive picture (Theoc. 7, adversely, seems to keep to the line of piety). Mestra's grandfather Triopas, a mythical Coan king, is the eponym of the Cnidian promontory opposite Cos. In Call. the locale of the crime is not Athens, as in the *Cat.*, but Thessaly, 24 (Pelasgians) οὔπω τὰν Κνιδίαν, ἔτι Δώτιον ἱρὸν ἔναιον, a region bearing ancient associations with Cos which were pointed out in *Demeter* fr. 15, and the region from which Chalcon derives his origin. It was these considerations which prompted Fraser ii, 916 n. 290 and Sh-W 306f. to the conclusion that Cos was the place of the hymn's performance. "Once we get rid of the preconception of h. 6 as a poem of actual performance, these arguments have little force" wrote Hopkinson 1984, 38–9. In fact, they may all be part of Call.'s emulation with P.

Most importantly, Demeter is for the first time brought into connection with the Erysichthon myth. The reasons for the innovation have been a lingering riddle. Fehling 1972, 178 considered the destruction of Demeter's grove as a "willkürlich gewählte Möglichkeit.... Unklar ist die Begründung mit der er [*sc.* Call.] es auf Demeter bezog".[138] A rationalising version in Diod. Sic. 5.61 (and possibly Lyc. 1393–96), one of the rare accounts derived from a vein unscathed by Call. or his influence, attributes the crime not to Erysichthon, but to his father Triopas. His version is then echoed in Marcellus

[138] For the literary tradition of Erysichthon's myth see Fehling 1972, 173–85, Hopkinson 1984, 18–30, Müller 1987, 65–76. For its treatment in art see U. Kron, *LIMC* IV.1, 14–8, C. W. Müller, *RhM* n.s. 133 (1988), 136–42.

of Side *EG* 1046.95–6 Kaibel and Hyg. *Astr.* 2.14.3, for which F. Ball (*Sphaera*, Leipzig 1903, 111 n. 2, cf. *id.* in Roscher vi, 922) suggested Hermippus the Callimachean as a possible source. This is commonly assumed to be the original tree-felling which Call. varied with Erysichthon taking the place of his father. It is unlikely that Call. invented the episode from scratch. Wil. 1924 ii, 37–8 thought that the contamination of Triopas' sacrilege with the Erysichthon myth had already happened in Call.'s source and later speculation postulated a recondite local story. This assumption rests on feeble premises. All testimonies of Erysichthon's crime against Demeter are derived from Call. and although this does not necessarily mean that he contaminated the story first, 24–30 relating it to the early history of the Pelasgians in Thessaly, adduced to support it, carry little weight to account for Erysichthon supplanting Triopas.

Demeter's association with Erysichthon serves Call.'s literary purpose in challenging P. and entails obvious advantages for him. Its weak point is the reason for Erysichthon's sacrilege: in Call. it is attributed to the perverted folly of his youth (so he is made to be an unmarried young man). His involvement provides numerous opportunities for grotesquerie and an appropriate aetium for his punishment with incessant hunger by the goddess of bounty. Müller 1987, 72 n. 244 (cf. also U. Kron, *LIMC* IV.1, 15) saw the transfer of Triopas' offence to Erysichthon as an attempt "den Heros Eponymos des Triopion zu entlasten", which was an area of particular interest to the Ptolemies (cf. Theoc. 17.68 with Σ, 321.14 Wendel) and the cult-centre of the Dorian Pentapolis (Hdt. 1.144.3). For the ties between Cnidus and Cos, including their common Argive and Thessalian ancestry, and Doric nature, cf. *IdC* ED 77 and inscr. 25 Curty (both 3rd/2nd cent. BC), the last mentioning τᾷ ὑ|[παρ]χούσᾳ ποτὶ Κνιδίος φιλίᾳ καὶ συγγένειᾳ, see Curty 52–4.

Crucially, Erysichthon's novel link with Demeter serves very well the poetic metaphor which underlies the poem. Demeter appears as a goddess protecting good measure in poetry. Those dear to her are contrasted to magnitude and excess. Erysichthon is the grotesque inversion of the poetic ideal, a latent poet who lost the sense of moderation. As such he turns against Demeter: with primitive ferocity he attacks her sacred grove. He does not speak, he only eats. He drinks not water, but wine (69f.). His unassuagable hunger is meaningfully expressed with the sea-metaphor of 89–90, familiar from *HyAp.* 105f.

In 91–3, like snow on the mountains, Erysichthon melts:

> ὡς δὲ Μίμαντι χιών, ὡς ἀελίῳ ἔνι πλαγγών,
> καὶ τούτων ἔτι μέζον ἐτάκετο, μέστ' ἐπὶ νεύροις·
> δειλαίῳ ῥινός (ἶνές *v.l.*) τε καὶ ὀστέα μῶνον ἐλείφθη.

For the first simile and its possible employment by P. cf. Theoc. 7.76 (Daphnis in love) εὖτε χιὼν ὥς τις κατετάκετο. For the second simile cf. Asclep. *HE* 36.1–2 ἐγὼ δέ/τήκομαι ὡς κηρὸς πὰρ πυρὶ κάλλος ὁρῶν of love, Theoc. 2.38–9 of magic. V. Langholf, *MHJ* 21 (1986), 10f. revealed a striking parallelism of these lines with Hippocr. *De flat.* 12.3 (V.1.120 Jouanna) καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ σάρκες ὑπάρχουσιν ἔτι αἱ τηξόμεναι· λείπεται γὰρ ὀστέα καὶ νεῦρα καὶ ἶνες (M, γράφεται καὶ ῥῖνες in marg.: ῥινὸς A) etc., which may suggest that this passage was mediated to Call. via P., see Appendix II.

Triopas' wish when addressing Poseidon is ambiguous too, 99–101 αὐτὰρ ἐμεῖο/τοῦτο τὸ δείλαιον γένετο βρέφος· αἴθε γὰρ αὐτόν/βλητὸν ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμαὶ χέρες ἐκτερέιξαν, since, as Call. knows, Apollo's capacity covers both archery and poetry, *HyAp.* 44 Φοίβῳ γὰρ καὶ τόξον ἐπιτρέπεται καὶ ἀοιδή. Erysichthon as a greedy βρέφος has a disparaging poetic touch too, and may be meant to be contrasted to a skinny sick child in *Demeter.* He eventually ends up begging for the dirty leftovers from the feast at a public crossroad, 114–7:

> καὶ τόχ' ὁ τῶ βασιλῆος ἐνὶ τριόδοισι καθῆστο
> αἰτίζων ἀκόλως τε καὶ ἔκβολα λύματα δαιτός.
> Δάματερ, μὴ τῆνος ἐμὶν φίλος, ὅς τοι ἀπεχθής,
> εἴη μηδ' ὁμότοιχος· ἐμοὶ κακογείτονες ἐχθροί.

For ἐνὶ τριόδοισι here cf. Call. *HE* 2.4 σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια and for Erysichthon's ἔκβολα λύματα, see p. 289f. on λύματα in *HyAp.* 109. The verses contain an aphorism of literary content expressed in terms particularly appropriate to the Alexandrian Museum, cf. ὁμότοιχος, τῶ βασιλῆος ~ *HyAp.* 26, 27, 68 of Ptolemy. Demeter is clearly evoked as the goddess of poetry.

IIIc. *Apollonius Rhodius*, Argonautica

Apollonius, who knew and utilised *Hermes*, in certain passages of the *Argonautica* turned his attention to *Demeter* too.[139] Philitan echoes would

[139] This section is indebted to Campbell 1981.

include 1.142–3 (cf. 1.115f.) ~ fr. 19, 1.283–4 ~ fr. 9, 1.1297 ~ fr. 11, 2.137–8 ~ fr. 9.1, 3.530 (cf. 4.1367) ~ fr. 7, 3.772–3 ~ fr. 10.3–4, 4.988–9 ~ fr. 5a (*At. Gl.* fr. 44), fr. 6. In 1.278f. Alcimede bids a melodramatic farewell to her departing son. There is a parallelism of two mothers either having lost or about to lose their only offspring. The blame in A.R. falls on a king with superior power, in P. on the king of gods (fr. 13.1 ἐκ Διὸς ἄλγεα πέσσειν): 279 (κακὴν) βασιλῆος ἐφετμὴν is picked up from *HHD* 358 (Διός) βασιλῆος ἐφετμῆς. Vv. 282–9 may reproduce a succession of Philitan notions:

τὸ γὰρ οἶον ἔην ἔτι λοιπὸν ἐέλδωρ
283 ἐκ σέθεν, ἄλλα δὲ πάντα πάλαι θρεπτήρια πέσσω.
νῦν γε μὲν ἡ τὸ πάροιθεν Ἀχαιιάδεσσιν ἀγητὴ
δμωὶς ὅπως κενεοῖσι λελείψομαι ἐν μεγάροισι,
σεῖο πόθῳ μινύθουσα δυσάμμορος, ᾧ ἔπι πολλὴν
287 ἀγλαΐην καὶ κῦδος ἔχον πάρος, ᾧ ἔπι μούνῳ
μίτρην πρῶτον ἔλυσα καὶ ὕστατον· ἔξοχα γάρ μοι
Εἰλήθυια θεὰ πολέος ἐμέγηρε τόκοιο.

Vv. 283–4 ἄλλα . . . πέσσω./νῦν is an *oppositio in imitatione* of fr. 9 νῦν δ' αἰεὶ πέσσω, τὸ δ' ἀέξεται ἄλλο νεῶρες/πῆμα. Other than the Philitan occurrences, this Apollonian verse contains the only metaphorical πέσσω of the extant Hellenistic poetry (two literary applications occur in Matro Pit. *SH* 534.6, 103). This takes as an object θρεπτήρια, which is related to Demeter as a goddess of nourishment and occurs in *HHD* 168, 223. Philitan δμωίδες in Chalcon's palace (fr. 17) resemble 285 δμωὶς . . κενεοῖσι . . ἐν μεγάροισι. V. 286 is modelled on *HHD* 201~304 ἧστο πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός.[140] The next clause lays emphasis on Alcimede's previous happiness. A similar notion has been suspected to precede fr. 9 νῦν δ' αἰεὶ πέσσω etc., a possibility well-matching the attention paid to that fragment in this passage. Then the status of the mother with a sole offspring and one who could not bear any other, equally well applies to Alcimede as to Demeter. As in P. with Chalcon, a consolatory effort by Jason follows.

In 4.866–79 A.R. handles the efforts of Thetis to immortalise Acchilleus, manifestly using diction and motifs from the Demeter/

[140] Vv. 285–6 are found in a different form in the *proecdosis* βείομαι οὐλομένοισιν ὀιζυρὴ ἀχέεσσιν/σεῖο πόθῳ, φίλε κοῦρε, δυσάμμορος.

Demophon episode in *HHD* 237f.[141] After this experimentation, Apollonius inserts a reference to a version of a provincial Demeter-visit. In 4.982f. the Argonauts reach Corfu. Two aetia are adduced to account for its ancient name *Drepane*: either a sickle (δρέπανον) buried under the island with which Cronus castrated his father, or another sickle with which Deo, while taking residence on the island, taught the Titans how to harvest wheat. A.R. apparently draws on a Cercyrean tradition and if the address to the Muses in 984–5 ἵλατε, Μοῦσαι,/οὐκ ἐθέλων ἐνέπω προτέρων ἔπος denotes approval of the Cronus-version and has a touch of polemic, this may be addressed to Call. apparently accepting the Deo-version, see Pfeiffer on fr. 14 and Vian iii, 29–30, 35. In these elegant Hellenistic verses A.R. might have admitted some vocabulary from *Demeter*. P. had treated Corfu and the Argonauts in what is being transmitted as *Telephus* fr. 22. The island is introduced in a way typical in epos (see Campbell 1981, 79 and cf. Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 956.5–6), 982–3 ἔστι δέ τις πορθμοῖο παροιτέρη Ἰονίοιο/ἀμφιλαφὴς πίειρα Κεραυνίῃ εἰν ἁλὶ νῆσος. ἀμφιλαφής comes up in two conspicuous passages possibly under Philitan influence, Call. *HyDem.* 26 (ἄλσος; Hopkinson ad loc. restores the Doric character of the term), *id.* *HyAp.* 42 (Ἀπόλλων) and this may be a third one. It occurs 3x in Call., 3x in A.R. (2.733 ἀμφιλαφεῖς πλατάνιστοι, cf. Plato *Phdr.* 230b) and Theoc. 24.46. Only here it applies to an island and only here in A.R. in the sense 'huge'. πίειρα occurs only here in A.R. πίων occurs in Theoc. 7.143 θέρεος μάλα πίονος, cf. 7.33. Call. *HyAp.* 65 uses βαθύγειον of Cyrene. Δηώ in 986, 988 was probably employed by P. In 989 the phrase στάχυν ὄμπνιον was discussed by P. in *At. Gl.* fr. 44, probably in the iambic sequence ὄμπνιον στάχυν. The adj. in a Demeter-context may be a novel Philitan application (fr. 5a).

One last passage is worth referring to, which if not directly indebted to P., presents a noticeable similarity of motifs. In 4.1393f.[142] the Argonauts, after having carried the Argo a long way on their shoulders, 'like rabid dogs' πίδακα μαστεύεσκον· ἐπὶ ξηρὴ γὰρ ἔκειτο/δίψα δυηπαθίῃ τε καὶ ἄλγεσιν. Eventually, they reach an ἱερὸν πέδον (1396) with golden apples and find the Hesperid Nymphs lamenting the

[141] See Richardson 1974, 237–8, Vian on A.R. 4.879, S. Jackson, *LCM* 15 (1990), 53–6. On A.R. depends [Apollod.] 3.13.6. The story possibly derives from the *Cypria*.

[142] Kyriakou 210f. interpreted this episode from a poetological perspective.

death of the monster Ladon who used to serve as guardian of the golden apples, 1406–07 ἀγχοῦ δ' Ἑσπερίδες, κεφαλαῖς ἔπι χεῖρας ἔχουσαι/ἀργυφέας ξανθῇσι, λίγ' ἔστενον. The ἱερὸν πέδον and the mourning of the blond Hesperid Nymphs (λίγ' ἔστενον, cf. Theoc. 7.141 ἔστενε τρυγών) bear a similarity to Demeter and the scenery around Bourina. In 1427–28 Ἑσπέρη αἴγειρος, πτελέη δ' Ἐρυθηὶς ἔγεντο,/Αἴγλη δ' ἰτείης ἱερὸν στύπος the phrase αἴγειρος, πτελέη juxtaposes the constituents of what may be a novel Philitan combination, but note the chiasmus in this verse with the two trees surrounded by the two Nymphs and cf. Pherenicus Heracl. *SH* 672 (Athen. 3.78b) Ὄξυλον . . . Ἁμαδρυάδι (: Δρυάδι Wil.) τῇ ἀδελφῇ μιγέντα μετ' ἄλλων γεννῆσαι . . . Αἴγειρον, Πτελέαν . . . καὶ ταύτας Ἁμαδρυάδας νύμφας καλεῖσθαι, which may suggest a mythographical list as a source here (for such lists of Hesperids see Roscher i.2, 2597.39f.). Orpheus recognises the divine creatures and implores them (1410 παρηγορέεσκε λιτῇσι). He asks for information about water, 1415–18: δείξατ' ἐελδομένοισιν . . ./ἤ τινα πετραίην χύσιν ὕδατος ἤ τινα γαίης/ἱερὸν ἐκβλύοντα, θεαί, ῥόον, ᾧ ἀπὸ δίψαν/αἰθομένην λωφήσομεν. In the end, he promises to pay them back once the Argonauts get home: μυρία δῶρα . . ./λοιβάς τ' εἰλαπίνας τε παρέξομεν (1420–21). All this constitutes a context which conceivably figured in *Demeter* with Chalcon requesting Demeter's help to find a water source and then paying her back with a rich feast.

In 1403–05 ἐν δὲ λιπόντων/*ὕδρης Λερναίης χόλον* αἵματι πικρὸν οἰστῶν,/*μυῖαι πυθομένοισιν ἐφ' ἕλκεσι τερσαίνοντο*, the poisonous juice of Lernaia and the putrefying corpse of Ladon with desiccated flies (the insect of decay *par excellence*, cf. *Il.* 19.24–7, see Janko on 16.641–4) around it, would provide a striking *oppositio* to Bourina's clear water with βουγενέας bees buzzing around it. Livrea (see against him Vian iii *Notes addit.*, 219) may be right in detecting an allusion to spontaneous generation. τερσαίνοντο might be meant to be a dehydrated contrast to the bees' association with water in P., cf. Call. *HyAp.* 110, Theoc. 7.142. In 1450f. the Argonauts rush off ἀσπαστὸν ἵνα σφίσι πέφραδεν Αἴγλη/πίδακα. The image of flies, greedily gathered around a tiny drop of honey, enriched with an image of ants who ὁμιλαδόν can carry very little weight, perseveres in 1452–56: ὡς δ' ὁπότε στεινὴν περὶ χηραμὸν εἱλίσσονται/γειοτόροι μύρμηκες ὁμιλαδόν, ἢ ὅτε μυῖαι/ἀμφ' ὀλίγην μέλιτος γλυκεροῦ λίβα πεπτηυῖαι/ἄπλητον μεμάασιν ἐπήτριμοι· ὡς τότ' ἀολλεῖς/πετραίῃ Μινύαι περὶ πίδακι δινεύεσκον. As vocabulary and images in this passage portray notions which in Call. and Theoc. have a poetological significance (see

Kyriakou 212–4), Apollonius, in an ironic, sordid reaction, might be thought to address those who crowd to employ them.[143]

IIId. *Nicander*

There are secure indications that the author of *Ther.* and *Alex.* (the 'elder' Nicander) knew and alluded to *Demeter.* If Hermesianax in *Ther.* 3 φίλ' Ἑρμησιάναξ, πολέων κυδίστατε παῶν, to whom the poem is addressed, is to be identified with Nic.'s compatriot poet (an unlikely possibility, cf. T. 16), an acquaintance with P. could be established on the basis of this link. Nic. is the author of *Glossai* in more than three books, frr. 120–145. His own interest in lexicography would lead him to P. He gives room to Philitan voices in similes or digressions mostly in *Alex.* In *Alex.* 126 οἷά τε δὴ γήρεια νέον τεθρυμμένα κάκτου he neatly echoes fr. 20 γηρύσαιτο δὲ νεβρὸς . . ./. . κάκτου τύμμα φυλαξαμένη. In 470 Nic. uses ὄστλιγγες in a different application, but perhaps dependent on fr. 11 (cf. Σ ad loc.). In *Ther.* 33 νήχυτος ὄρπηξ/ Nic. takes up a Philitan coinage (fr. 7) with which it is quoted in the Etymologica. In *ibid.* 70, 73 he mentions κόνυζα and ἀσφόδελος side by side as in Theoc. 7.68.

In *Alex.* 433–64 Nic. discusses the paralytic effect of the poppy. Within this context Nic. comes to mention the medicinal use of honey, 445–51:

τοτὲ δ' ἔργα διαθρύψαιο μελίσσης
446 ἄμμιγα ποιπνύων Ὑμησσίδος αἵ τ' ἀπὸ μόσχου
σκήνεος ἐξεγένοντο δεδουπότος ἐν νεμέεσσιν·
ἔνθα δὲ καὶ κοίλοιο κατὰ δρυὸς ἐκτίσσαντο
πρῶτόν που θαλάμας συνομήρεες, ἀμφὶ καὶ ἔργων
450 μνησάμεναι Δηοῖ πολυωπέας ἤνυσαν ὄμπας
βοσκόμεναι θύμα ποσσὶ καὶ ἀνθεμόεσσαν ἐρείκην.

Here Nic. might rework motifs from *Demeter.* First comes a reference to bugony, to which P. provides one of the earliest — if not the

[143] The image of ants is particularly apposite to denote the blind following of a leader, cf. Ael. *NA* 6.43 οἱ δὲ μύρμηκες προϊόντες ὥσπερ οὖν ἐπισιτίσασθαι, τοῖς μεγίστοις ἕπονται οἱ δὲ ἄγουσι στρατηγῶν δίκην, *ibid.* 2.25, already anticipated in Arist. *HA* 622b25 ἀεὶ μίαν ἀτραπὸν πάντες βαδίζουσι, see Davies-Kathirithamby 39. This might glance at P.'s conceivable claim to lead other poets, cf. Prop. T. 23c.12 *scriptorumque meas turba secuta rotas.* On ants as a busy multitude see Gow on Theoc. 15.45.

earliest — references in Greek literature (fr. 14). Nic.'s two brief references (here and *Ther.* 741) might suggest a more detailed treatment in his *Melissourgika*. The only explicit reference to this work (Collum. 9.2.4 = fr. 94 with Schneider ad loc.) is about bees first appearing *Cretae Saturni temporibus*. For ποιπνύων in this context cf. fr. 14 φθάμενος, for Ὑμησσίδος cf. Call. fr. 2a.49. The Σ 448d15 (p. 158 Geymonat) note φησὶ δὲ ὅτι ἐν τῷ Ὑμεττῷ πρῶτον ἐγένοντο μέλισσαι (perhaps a piece of information not derived from Nic.: contrast *Melissourgica l.l.*). If P. hinted at the parentage of Melissai from their primogenitors in Parnassus (see Appendix I, Hsch. μ 1294 μητροπόλους), he might have hinted at the place of origin of the actual bees as well. If, as assumed in fr. 14, Chalcon was stung by bees in the *locus*-scene and Demeter rushed to cure him (thus teaching the medicinal use of honey), the lines may reflect her treatment of Chalcon.

Then comes what Gow-Scholfield ad loc. described as a "seemingly irrelevant digression". The description of the bees' activities in association with Deo may play with the ambiguity bees/Nymphs Melissai, which might have featured in P. and is known from the coda of Call. *HyAp*. The bees nest in a hollow tree, κοίλοιο κατὰ δρυός (δρῦς = 'tree', see Seaford on Eur. *Cycl.* 383), a widespread image in didactic poetry,[144] here perhaps alluding to the etymology of μέλισσα from παρόσον ἐπὶ τῶν μήλων ἱζάνει, on which P. might have formed his striking coinage ὀροδεμνιάδες. συνομήρεες equally well applies to bees and Melissai. ἔργων comprises allusions to the industry of bees and of Nymphs/Melissai (and its literary symbolism). θαλάμας and ἔργων/μνησάμεναι evokes P.'s possible image of Nymphs weaving in their Coan cave. ἔργων would suitably describe this activity. These 'bees' offer (ἤνυσαν: ὤπασαν *v.l.* Σ) ὄμπας to Deo, as they do with a water trickle in Call. *HyAp.* 110. In πολυωπέας there may lurk a hint at the Melissai's thin garments, cf. *Alex.* 323 ὀθόνης πολυωπέι κόλπῳ. ὄμπη is an Attic vocable glossed by Hsch. ο 823 as πυροὶ μέλιτι δεδευμένοι, i.e. cakes of meal and honey, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 681. The word makes a cultic allusion. Σ 450e9 (p. 159 Geymonat) note its usage in Demeter's worship (τούτους γὰρ Δήμητρι ἔθυον) and its idionyncratic employment here (Νίκανδρος ἰδίως εἴρηκε τὰ κηρία ὄμπας). It occurs 2x in Call. as an offering to

[144] Cf. Hes. *WD* 232–3 οὔρεσι δὲ δρῦς/ἄκρη μέν τε φέρει βαλάνους, μέσση δὲ μελίσσας, see Cook 18, West on Hes. *Theog.* 594.

chthonic gods and here in Nic. It subsequently disappears from poetry. For 'bees' βοσκόμεναι flora in 551 cf. a Nymph/Muse in her grotto in Prop. T. 23d.36 *manu texit utraque rosam* and note the playful contrast *manu*/ποσσί. Σ 451b5 (p. 159 Geymonat) note the usage of ἐρείκη in the worship of Demeter, τὰ φύλλα οἱ μυούμενοι ὑποστρωννύουσι διὰ το ψυκτικὰ εἶναι καὶ ἁγνά.

For the expression ἔργα . . μελίσσης in 445 cf. also *Alex.* 547, 554 ἱερὰ ἔργα μελίσσης, 144 μελισσάων καμάτῳ, Call. *HyJov.* 50, Nicias *HE* 6.3, Theoc. 22.42, A.R. 4.1132–33, Arat. 1030. Δηοῖ in 450 constantly recurs in passages where P. seems to be at work. The form is usually taken as a hypocoristic of Δημήτηρ, which would tally with P.'s conceivable Χάλκων for Χαλκώδων. Δηώ is not Homeric or Hesiodic; it originally occurs in a firmly Attic ambience, 3x in *HHD* (47, 211, 492), then *CEG* 317.1 (Attica, *c.* 450 BC), Soph. *Ant.* 1121, Eur. 4x. It has been conjectured in Antim. fr. 126.2 = *SH* 74.2]̣ουσαι by M. L. West, then Call. 7x, A.R. 4x, Euph. *CA* 9.14, Theoc. and Lyc. 1x each (none of the last four is known to have ever used Δημήτηρ), Diosc. *HE* 19.9, Nicarch. *HE* 4.2, Antip. Sid. *HE* 57.3, Mosch. fr. 4.4.[145] In Call. *HyAp.* 110, *HyDem.* 17 (and 132), Theoc. 7.3, Nic. *Alex.* 450 (all in dative), A.R. 4.986, 988 (see A. Rengakos, *ZPE* 102 (1994), 124 n. 61) and Lyc. 621 Δηοῦς . . . ὄμπνιον στάχυν one may reckon with direct Philitan dependence. He apparently revived it from *HHD* and impetus was granted by Call. and A.R.

Demeter appears as holding in her hands μάκωνας in passages possibly reproducing an image from *Demeter*, Theoc. 7.157 and Call. *HyDem.* 44. μήκων is a Homeric hapax (*Il.* 8.306–7 μήκων . . . ἥ τ' ἐνὶ κήπῳ/καρπῷ βριθομένη νοτίῃσί τε εἰαρινῇσι etc.) associated with death, and although it may be an early attribute of Demeter as a symbol of fertility (Fraser on Ov. *F.* 4.531 (p. 292), E. Voutiras, *Chiron* 29 (1999), 245f.), it is only in these passages that a tradition

[145] See Richardson on *HHD* 47, Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 17, Campbell on A.R. 3.414. Next Antip. Thess. *GPh* 82.3, 8, 101.2, Antiph. *GPh* 15.5, 22.3, 39.5, Zonas *GPh* 2.1, Archias *GPh* 19.8, Anon. *FGE* 47.5, *GVI* 720.1 (Attica, 2nd cent. AD), 879.3 (Eleusis, 3rd cent. AD), *EG* 863.4, 864.2, 866.1 Kaibel (all Eleusis or Athens, "Rom. aet."), *ibid.* 1064 (*c.* 161 AD), *SEG* 39.1673.14 (1st/2nd cent. AD), *AVI* 20.3 (Eleusis, 3rd cent. AD), Anon. *GDRK* 22.verso.20, Opp. *Hal.* 2.19, 4.497, Nonn. *D.* 30x (Δημήτηρ 17x). The form is frequent in Attica, but only in verse inscriptions, see Threatte ii, 260–2. Call. *Hec.* fr. 103.2 = 302.2 Pf., *q.v.* has Δηιώνην (: Δηωίνην Valckenaer) ~ Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 927b.7, an inscription of the 2nd cent. BC from Didyma Δηωίς (*LSJ Suppl.* s.v.).

linking it with her is established, cf. also Call. *Hec.* fr. 102, Virg. *G.* 1.212 = Collum. 10.314 *Cereale papaver.* These considerations suggest a link to a version according to which Demeter broke her fast with a poppy. This was known to Ov. *F.* 4.531–4 *illa soporiferum, parvos initura penates,/colligit agresti lene papaver humo;/dum legit, oblito fertur gustasse palato/longamque imprudens exsoluisse famem,* and probably to Call. fr. 574 ὁ δὴ μήκωνα πατεῖται. So poppies might have appeared in P. as Demeter's dinner with which she broke her fast (a substitute for *HHD*'s cyceon).[146] Note that μήκωνες are among the plants in Philetas' garden in Longus 2.3.4. Servius on Virg. *G.* 1.212 (III.181 Thilo) *Cereale papaver:... vel quod Ceres eo usa est ad oblivionem doloris: nam ob raptum Proserpinae vigiliis <agitata> gustato eo acta est in soporem,* knows of a version according to which Demeter tasted of a poppy to assuage her grief. The ancient commentators of Virgil are known to have used commentaries on Call. and Theoc. (Pfeiffer ii, xxx n. 6), whence they could pick this information up. This was the main medicinal use of the poppy with which Coan physicians were familiar, cf. Hippocr.'s μηκώνιον ὑπνωτικόν and Hsch. μ 1181 μήκωνες· πόα τις λήθην ἐμποιοῦσα (Steier, *RE* XV.2.2436–37, 2440). Demeter may have taken advantage of Coan know-how on curing mental grief. Note that Nic. introduces this passage (433–4) with καί τε σὺ μήκωνος κεβληγόνου ὁππότε δάκρυ/πίνωσιν, πεπύθοιο καθυπνέας and that in Ov. *F.* 4.547–8 Demeter, faithful to her fast, puts Triptolemus to sleep with a poppy: *abstinet alma Ceres somnique papavera causas/dat tibi cum tepido lacte bibenda, puer.* Burkert 1983, 281 suggests that the poppies on a frieze from the Eleusinion may be thought to still the fear of the child initiated each year in the mysteries.

The reference to the Ascalabus-myth in *Ther.* 483–7 might be a conscious inversion of the ascalabus' activity in P.: child Ascalabus' transformation into a gecko may glance at an ascalabus biting a child in P., see p. 237f. Another link in the treatment of the same episode emerges with the employment of the motif of Demeter's

---

[146] πάσ(σ)ατο would be the proper verb to express Demeter's break of fast. Cf. *HHD* 49–50 οὐδέ ποτ' ἀμβροσίης καὶ νέκταρος ἡδυπότοιο/πάσσατ' ἀκηχεμένη, 200 ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος (cf. 413 of Persephone), Call. *HyDem.* 6 (fasting women) ἄπαστοι, fr. 574. Its ambiguous usage is fitting: 'try, taste (food or drink)' in Homer, 'have my fill (of food or drink)' in the νεώτεροι, cf. Athen. 1.23f–24a, Call. *HyDem.* 68 of the insatiable hunger of Erysichthon ('devour'). The verb is the *vox propria* to denote cessation of fast for mourning persons, cf. *Il.* 24.641 (Priam), 21.76, A.R. 1.1072, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 476, Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 68.

ardent thirst. In Ant. Lib. 24 from the 4th book of Nic.'s *Heteroioumena* (fr. 56) Demeter in Attica finds herself in a condition similar to the one in *Demeter*: καὶ αὐτὴν <αὔην> [a certain addition from Lact. Plac. *Fab.* 5.7 *Ceres . . . aestu torrida*] ὑπὸ πολλοῦ καύματος ὑποδέχεται Μίσμη καὶ διδοῖ ποτὸν ὕδωρ ἐμβαλοῦσα γλήχωνα [cf. *Alex.* 128] καὶ ἄλφιτον εἰς αὐτό. (2) καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ ἐξέπιε κατὰ τὸ δίψος τὸ ποτὸν ἀθροῦν. Contrast *HHD* 210–1 where the goddess, as is appropriate, decently drinks her cyceon. The motif of Demeter's eagerness here may be a reworking of a poignant reference to Demeter during Chalcon's banquet, cf. Theoc.'s possible adaptation in 7.69–70 (Lycidas) πίομαι μαλακῶς μεμναμένος Ἀγεάνακτος (~ Persephone?)/αὐταῖσιν κυλίκεσσι καὶ ἐς τρύγα χεῖλος ἐρείδων. Ascalabus cannot refrain from insolently commenting on it. He is turned into a gecko. The motif of Demeter's thirst is alluded to in another Nicandrean passage, *Alex.* 131 (Deo at Eleusis) λαυκανίην ἔβρεξεν, and it appears in Ov. *Met.* 5.446–7 *fessa labore sitim conlegerat, oraque nulli/conluerant fontes* (until she saw the house of Misme). The last phrasing implies abstention from both drinking and bathing (Hinds 84). It would appear that the Colophonian integrated Philitan innovations in a more traditional context.

IIIe. *Philicus*, Hymn to Demeter

Philicus of Corcyra's *floruit* is placed by Suid. φ 358 (*TrGF* 104 T 1) during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus and he is therefore some years younger than P. As the chief priest of Dionysus in Alexandria he took part in the famous procession of Ptolemy leading the περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίτας (Callix. Rhod. *FGrH* 627 F 2 (p. 169.8–9) = *TrGF* 104 T 4). Since the Ptolemaic house claimed to have a special relation with Dionysus and showed favour to his cult (Gow on Theoc. 17.26, 108, 112), Philicus must have had close ties with the royal family. His *Hymn to Demeter*, composed in choriambic hexameters, seems to make a witty reference to *Demeter* in *SH* 680.39–41:

]. [.]ς δ. . [.] κ̣ρηναῖον ἑκάστης ἓν ὕδωρ ὁρισθέν
]. πουδ[. . . .]γ̣ου σοῖς προσανήσεις δακρύοισι πηγήν
]λει̣τ̣αι βασ[ί]λεια κρήνη

39 δ̣ίχ[α] Gallavotti, "fort. recte" *SH* 41 e.g. οὔποτ' ὀ]λεῖται vel κα]λεῖται Vogliano

V. 39 seems to envisage two different sources of water and may allude to the duality of contrasting waters in *Demeter*, to which Call. >

Prop. T. 23c.6 *quamque bibistis aquam?* might allude. In 40 two elements from *Demeter* seem to be conflated: the tears of Demeter (fr. 12) and the creation of a well (see fr. 6). The spirited allusion relies on the motif of Demeter sitting at a well in mourning disposition and exploits the motif of creating a well out of one's tears,[147] and might allude to a conceivable image of melting snow employed by P. of Demeter's weeping, see p. 299. If the choriambic fragment with a polemic tone over poetics published as Adesp. Pap. Misc. *SH* 993.6–8]τ̣ε κρήνη φιλομουσ̣ [/]καλα Λειβηθριάδων̣ [/]ε̣γεπνεύσατε φωνη[is by Philicus, he may have used the κρήνη-image with poetological connotations elsewhere too. The Philitan context seems to persevere in the next verse as well. Vogliano's οὔποτ' ὀ]λεῖται would emulate Solon's praise of Athens (*IEG* 4.1) and may hint at P.'s claim for eternal fame. Demeter is invoked as βασίλεια in Ar. *Ran.* 382, Pampr. 3.126, 156, βασίλισσα in an inscription of Roman times in N. Galatia (*LSJ Suppl.* s.v.) and cf. Hsch. ε 6695 Εὐάνασσα· ἡ Δημήτηρ. This is an attribute denoting religious authority (Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 52) with civic associations, and was known in Cos. *GVI* 1158.21, a Coan stele of the 1st cent. BC, evokes Persephone as ὦ βασίλεια, Διὸς πολυώνυμε κούρα and *HG* 2.5 = *IdC* ED 241.5 (4th cent. BC) employ it of Hera. Frequent invocations are appropriate in passionate entreaties, but the adj. here seems to refer to the following κρήνη and the allusion points rather to the spring created by the Coan king Chalcon on the instructions of Demeter than to the daughters of Celeus in *HHD.* P., who was interested in stressing Demeter's political power as patronising the Coan royals, could have employed this term. Other affinities, as the presence of the Nymphs in 31–2, 51, or the anointed crown of Demeter's initiates in 38, 60, are of a more general character.

---

[147] Cf. e.g. Parth. *Erot. path.* 11.4. The 'flood of tears' (νᾶμα or πηγὴ δακρύων) is a topos in tragedy, see Bond on Eur. *Her.* 449–50 and cf. then Men. *Sic.* 219, Posid. *SH* 705.19, [Mosch.] *Megara* 45–6, *EB* 28–9, Nonn. *D.* 46.354.

Telephus?

Fr. 22

This Apollonian Σ provides the only testimony for a Philitan work entitled *Telephus*. According to it, the marriage of Jason and Medea took place in Corcyra, not in the cave of Macris as in A.R., but in the house of Alcinous. The venue of the pairing of the young couple varies from version to version: Iolcus seems to be implied in Hes. *Theog*. 997–9, Colchis near the river Phasis in Antim. *Lyde* fr. 75 (with Aeetes' consent in Timonax *FGrH* 842 F 2), Byzantium in Dion. Scyt. *FGrH* 32 F 3 (fr. 31 Rusten) or Corcyra in Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 87, P. (Alcinous' palace), A.R. (Macris' cave) and possibly Call. (see Vian iii, 33 n. 7 with reference to *Aet.* frr. 9, 12).[1] The marriage in Cercyra at a late stage of the return-journey is perhaps a late localisation facilitated by Cercyra's established tradition of hospitality and advanced in relation to an alleged Argonautic colonisation of some Tyrrhenian cities (see Jacoby on Timaeus *FGrH* 566 F 84–8). This appears to be the context in Timaeus and he may be the common source of P., A.R. and Call. There is little point in asking whether the location in the version of A.R. is older than that of P. (P. Friedländer, *RhM* n.s. 69 (1914), 315). The Apollonian is a more exquisite place and might be A.R.'s own innovation, adopting as a prototype the marriage of Peleus and Thetis in the cave of Chiron, see Vian iii, 49f., Hunter 1993, 73–4. The strong wording of 4.1141 ἔνθα [*sc.* in Macris' cave] τότ' ἐστόρεσαν λέκτρον μέγα etc. and esp. 4.1161–64:

οὐ μὲν ἐν 'Αλκινόοιο γάμον μενέαινε τελέσσαι
ἥρως Αἰσονίδης, μεγάροις δ' ἐνὶ πατρὸς ἑοῖο
νοστήσας ἐς 'Ιωλκὸν ὑπότροπος· ὣς δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ
Μήδεια φρονέεσκε· τότ' αὖ χρεὼ ἦγε μιγῆναι

indicate that A.R. was aware of alternative traditions. P., on the other hand, might have had his own reasons for imposing a coupling in Alcinous' house.

The content of this poem? is controversial. Some related it to P.'s deceased father Telephus.[2] T. 11a would suggest a strong allegiance

---

[1] All supplied by Apollonian Σ. See Wil. 1924 ii, 198, M. W. Haslam on POxy. 3698.16f., Vian iii, 33, A. Dyck, *Hermes* 117 (1989), 464–5.

[2] See Rohde 1914, 79 n. 3 who attributes the idea to J. G. Schneider, Couat

of P. and his parents and *A. S. Hollis suspected some reference to the burial of P.'s mother in one of his poems on the strength of Σ Theoc. T. 12a. Rohde compared Parthenius Chius, an early 4th cent. BC epic poet who, according to Suid. π 665, ἐποίησε εἰς Θέστορα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα, i.e. composed a poem in honour of his father (cf. Plato *Phd.* 61b εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἐποίησα). One thinks of an epicedium, an almost entirely lost genre which enjoyed some popularity in Hellenistic times and later in Rome. Arat. *SH* 103–5, Theoc. according to τινες in Suid. T. 1a Gow, Euph. *CA* 21, and Parthenius, who seems to have specialised in the field (*SH* 608–9, cf. 610–4, 615, 618–9, 626, 629, see Lightfoot 34–5), wrote such poems about friends or relatives. These did not so much have a biographical content, but rather insisted on the grief felt by the poet due to the loss of the person involved and its parallelism with mythological examples. If P.'s was such a poem the genre would originate in him.[3] The full title would be Ἐπικήδειον εἰς Τήλεφον which would normally be abbreviated as Πρὸς (or Εἰς) Τήλεφον, but a reference to the name alone is paralleled with Parth. *SH* 618–9 Βίας or εἰς Βίαντα of what seems to have been an epicedium and possibly *SH* 606 Ἀρήτη belonging either to Ἀρήτης ἐγκώμιον (*SH* 607) or to Ἀρήτης ἐπικήδειον (*SH* 608–9).

Others take the alleged title to refer to the celebrated Mysian hero whose story was first dealt with in the *Cypria EGF* p. 42.47–9, 53–4, but one that became a celebrity with the much discussed play of Euripides. If that was the subject of P.'s poem, a link with the Argonauts' sojourn in Corcyra might be established on the basis of erotic misconduct, being for Telephus a kind of family tradition. In Hes. *Cat.* fr. 165 Auge, mother of Telephus, is consigned by the gods to the care of Teuthras, the Mysian king, not as his wife but as an adopted daughter. There, not in Tegea, she pairs with Heracles to give birth to Telephus, see West 1985, 93–4. Telephus himself

---

75, Wil. 1912, 290, *id.* 1924 ii, 142, Webster 40, K. Kost in *KWH*, 149, *Campbell. It is probably from Euphorion's Ἐπικήδειον εἰς Πρωταγόραν *CA* 21 that Wil. 1924 i, 115, followed by K. Kost in *KWH*, 196, claimed that P.'s poem was written in hexameters. However, Parthenius wrote epicedeia in elegiacs. R. Pfeiffer, *CQ* 37 (1943), 32 n. 3 was adamant that the poem is not related to P.'s father: "There is not the slightest probability that Philetas' *Telephos* . . . was an epicedium for his father", cf. also A. Lesky, *Gesch. der griech. Lit.*, Bern [3]1971, 789, E. Calderon, *EClás* 30 (1988), 23.

[3] F. Jacoby, *RhM* n.s. 60 (1905), 47, 55, 66 consistently held an alleged *Bittis* by P. as an epicedium.

was charged with such behaviour too. According to a genealogy going back to the *Ilias Parva EGF* p. 52.14 and fr. 7 he coupled secretly with Astyoche, Priam's sister, who gave birth to Eurypylus, cf. Q.S. 6.135–8. The Argonautic episode in Corcyra would be a mythological digression and the secret-liaison motif would play a significant part in that poem.

But a third possibility perhaps lies closer to the truth. Bach 60 proposed to read Φιλητᾶς δὲ ὁ Τηλέφου ("fort. recte" Powell, cf. also Susemihl i, 177 n. 19). The possibility of a corruption is not hard to imagine: the transmitted *ἐν Τηλέφῳ* would be an assimilation to the following *ἐν τῇ Ἀλκινόου*. Bach's emendation would derive support by the possibility of this being an early exegetical Σ, as a grammarian early enough to be unaffected by Call.'s 'Coan' byname for P. (Chares?) may have actually written Φιλίτας δὲ ὁ Τηλέφου, cf. Proclus T. 18a τὸν τοῦ Τηλέφου Φιλήταν τὸν Κῷον. If so, the poem *Telephus* and all that goes with it would be a phantom.

The fact that this Apollonian Σ discusses the venues in different authors does not indicate where the burden in P. fell. The Σ about the Coan, separate from that on A.R. 4.1153 (308.7 Wendel) providing similar information, seems to be an early contribution to the exegesis of A.R.'s poem. It could go back to Chares, a γνώριμος and early commentator of A.R. who according to Σ 2.1052–57a (203.12 Wendel) wrote a treatise on the myths occurring in the *Argonautica* (Περὶ ἱστοριῶν τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου), whence it would survive through Theon.

It would seem possible that the Jason/Medea episode could be accommodated in *Hermes*. Abuse of hospitality with an illegitimate coupling is the subject-matter of the Odysseus-episode in that poem. If this is the case, the marriage in P. would have to take place in Alcinous' palace. A.R.'s version, making Alcinous' judgement about Medea's future depend upon her previous marriage with Jason, may be a compromising invention with grotesque overtones. Possibly, some of the facetious details in the secret marriage of Jason and Medea in A.R. are a reworking of motifs from P.[4] The dealings of the

[4] In particular, note that in A.R. the marriage takes place in the night while Alcinous sleeps (4.1110 καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐπισχεδὸν εὔνασεν ὕπνος), see fr. 1.2d κρύφα συνῆν for Hermes' possible involvement. Jason and Medea depart from Drepane in full honour with plenty of gifts from Alcinous and Arete, 4.1219f. Apollonius 4.1142–43 notes that care is being taken ὄφρα πέλοιτο/τιμήεις τε γάμος καὶ ἀοίδιμος. In him it is the role of Hera, goddess of legitimate marriage, which is emphasised, 4.1185, 1199–1200.

stranger Odysseus with Nausicaa in Scheria/Cercyra in *Od.* 6 might have served here as a potential precedent. The Phaeacians' reputation for hospitality would be ironically exploited, cf. the possibly poignant Call. *HyDel.* 156 Κέρκυρα φιλοξεινωτάτη ἄλλων of wandering Leto searching for a shelter after her illegitimate coupling with Zeus. As the Odysseus-story shows, a traditional link between this particular episode and Hermes is not a prerequisite for treatment in P.'s poem. However, the story is of a cunning/erotic character and Jason displays (as does Odysseus) a capability to manipulate people and esp. women. Within context this could be attributed to the fact that Jason, like Odysseus, is a grandson of Hermes' son Autolycus, whose daughter Polymele (or Polymede, see P. Dräger, *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Pherekydes von Athen*, Stuttgart 1995, 73–84) was Jason's mother, Hes. *Cat.* fr. 38 = Σ *Od.* 12.69 (II.533 Dindorf), *ibid.* fr. 43a.1?, Apollod. 1.9.16, *al.*

Szadeczky-Kardoss 162–3, surmising an influence by Mimnermus, and *Campbell suggested that the Coan elaborated on the Argonautic myth at length. The fact that of his treatment it is only this piece of information that is recorded, might, nevertheless, imply that P. confined himself to the proceedings at Corcyra. If the information would derive from *Hermes*, a broad treatment would seem out of that poem's spirit.

Epigrams and Paegnia

I. *Commentary*

Fr. 23

"Reliquiarum Philetae omnium specimen pulcherrimum" (Kuchenmüller 66). The deceased brings forward three requests in two verses. The unexpected reply comes from a character with principles, cf. the sharp correspondences of 1 μέ ~ 3 σέ, 4 σοί and 1 κλαῦσαι ~ 3 οὐ κλαίω. There is no reason to lament the end of a happy life: death is everybody's common destiny. The two successive quotations in Stobaeus, the first ascribed to *Paegnia*, the second to *Epigrams*, are apparently one unit (Wil. 1924 i, 116 and, if hesitantly, *HE* ii, 477–8). This is due to their evident coherence (note the correspondences noted above as well as the metrical correspondence of 1 and 3), to the fact that 1–2 could not be placed among the παρηγορικά on their own and to the fact that Euph. *CA* 21 (quoted in n. 1b) reviews the whole epigram rather than the first couplet only. The epigram incorporates typical elements of funerary inscriptions, such as the address to the wayfarer and the request for sympathy.[1] It seems that this sensitive creation belongs to the transitional period from *Steinepigramm* to *Buchepigramm*. It constitutes an indication of P.'s role at the dawn of the literary epigram.

23.1a. ἐκ θυμοῦ is an expression for strong feelings, cf. *Il.* *9.343 (Achilleus of Briseis) ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον ~ *Il.* *9.486 (Phoenix of Achilleus) for which cf. Σ vet. Ar. *Plut.* 635b (p. 110 Chantry) ἐξωμμάτωται: . . . ἀντὶ τοῦ 'ἐπιτεταμένως ὁρᾷ'· ἡ γὰρ 'ἐξ' ἐπίτασιν δηλοῖ, ὡς τὸ 'ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον', then Hes. fr. *58.4, Theogn. *62, Phanocl. *CA* *1.2 ἐκ θυμοῦ Κάλαϊν στέρξε (pent.), Theoc. *17.130, [Mosch.] *Megara* *60 ἐκ θυμοῦ στενάχουσα, Bion fr. *9.2, Naumach. *GDRK* *29.33, Q.S. 1.423, 3.505, *al.*, and in an interpolated verse Theoc. *2.61. In tragedy only Aesch. *Ag.* 48 ἐκ θυμοῦ κλάζοντες Ἄρη, Adesp. *TrGF* 458.7 (anger) εἶπέ τ' ἐκ θυμοῦ τάδε, not in Aristophanes. The reaction

[1] The address to the wayfarer is "fundamentally appropriate to the inscribed epitaph", see Lattimore 230–4, Sourvinou-Inwood 279–84. On the typical στῆθι καὶ οἴκτιρον request see Lattimore 234–5.

should be moderate (μέτρια), but genuine (ἐκ θυμοῦ). Note the heavy spondaic beginning of 1 and 3 (cf. fr. 9.1 in a similar context).

23.1b. τὰ μέτρια μέτρον is often employed to define the appropriate intensity in the expression of funerary grief, cf. Euph.'s imitation in Ἐπικήδειον εἰς Πρωταγόραν *CA* 21 τῷ καὶ μέτρια μέν τις ἐπὶ φθιμένῳ ἀκάχοιτο,/μέτρια καὶ κλαύσειεν· ἐπεὶ καὶ πάμπαν ἄδακρυν/Μοῖραι †ἐσκμήναντο (Stob. *MA*: ἐσημήναντο Stob. *S*: ἐσικχήναντο Meineke), Eur. fr. 46 τὸ δὲ κοινὸν ἄχος/μετρίως ἀλγεῖν σοφία μελετᾷ, *id.* fr. 418, Antiphan. *PCG* 54.1 πενθεῖν δὲ μετρίως τοὺς προσήκοντας φίλους and *GVI* 1740.5–6 (1st cent. BC; deceased mother) ἂν καὶ παρακαλῶ δακρύ|ειν ὅσον θέμις,/κοιναὶ γὰρ ἀν|θρώποισιν αἱ τοῖαι τύχαι. All philosophical trends favoured moderation in mourning, even the Academy (cf. Plato *Rep.* 387e) and, significantly, Peripatus which opposed Stoic ἀπάθεια for μετριοπάθεια, cf. [Plut.] *Cons. Apoll.* 102c–d οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε συμφέρομαι τοῖς ὑμνοῦσι τὴν ἄγριον καὶ σκληρὰν ἀπάθειαν . . . τὸ δὲ πέρα τοῦ μέτρου παρεκφέρεσθαι . . . παρὰ φύσιν εἶναί φημι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν φαύλης γίγνεσθαι δόξης, see R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolations-Literatur*, Munich 1958, 56–7, 93–4 and the illuminating note of N-H on Hor. *C.* 1.24.1. μέτρια for μετρίως is rare. τὰ preceding it specifies the boundaries of moderation: "articulo ostenditur modum quendam solitum ac certum maeroris esse, ultra quem procedere non deceat", Nowacki 50, cf. Plato *Leg.* 918d κερδαίνειν τὰ μέτρια. To the call for moderation by the deceased Reitzenstein 1893, 179 contrasted Solon *IEG* 21 μηδέ μοι ἄκλαυτος θάνατος μόλοι, ἀλλὰ φίλοισι/καλλείποιμι θανὼν ἄλγεα καὶ στοναχάς, but his attempt to correlate Mimn. *IEG* 11 is futile, see Allen 65–6.

23.1c. προσηνές is non-epic (the common epic is ἤπιος) and rare in Hellenistic poetry, Leon. Tar. *HE* 11.9, 19.3, 80.3, Adesp. Pap. *CA* 18.i.10 (Cercidas?), Adesp. Pap. Eleg. (Parth.?) *SH* 966.9 πρ]οσηνέα, Anon. PSchubart 6.12 (saec. p.C. III) = Antim. Dub. fr. 200.12]ι̣σα̣νε̣ς ("possis [προ]σανές" Schubart; most uncertain), but often in contemporary funerary inscriptions (mostly as a virtue of the deceased), cf. *GVI* 677.5 (3rd/2nd cent. BC), 843.1–2 (2nd/1st cent. BC) Λυσίμαχον μύθοι[σ]ι προσηνέα πᾶσι πολίταις/καὶ ξίνοις, 1112a.2 (2nd/3rd cent. BC), *SEG* 28.1042.7 (late Hellenistic), 30.1410.1 (1st cent. BC). The word first in Emped., then Anacr. and Pind., Hdt. 2.94.2 and late prose, cf. also Anon. *PMG* 919.8. Of speech Thuc. 6.77.2 ἑκάστοις τι προσηνὲς λέγοντες.

23.2. μεμνῆσθαι δ' οὐκέτ' ἐόντος ὁμῶς/ Cf. *Od.* 1.289 τεθνηῶτος.. μηδ' ἔτ' ἐόντος/, Arat. 373 τις ἀνδρῶν οὐκέτ' ἐόντων/. The phrase had an impact on A.R. 1.896 (Hypsipyle to Jason) μνώεο μήν, ἀπεὼν περ ὁμῶς/ (*plurr.*: ὅμως *unus*). The infinitives give the entreaty a solemn tone. Bergk's ὅμως 'none the less' is derived from ὁμῶς 'equally, simultaneously'[2] and often appears with a concessive participle, but ὁμῶς is secured by the Apollonian passage and by the fact that the exhortations κλαῦσαί με τὰ μέτρια and μεμνῆσθαι οὐκέτ' ἐόντος are supplementary rather than antithetical.

23.3a. οὐ κλαίω answers only one of the three requests. Along with the more common request to shed a tear of sympathy, often the deceased himself produces various reasons for which one should not weep for his fate. In some instances he claims his death to be vindicated by a worthy life, cf. Carp(h)yl. *HE* 1.1–2 μὴ μέμψῃ παριὼν τὰ μνήματά μου, παροδῖτα·/οὐδὲν ἔχω θρήνων ἄξιον οὐδὲ θανών etc., Posid. *SH* 705.21f. μηδέ τις οὖν χεῦαι δάκρυον etc., *IMEG* 35.7f. (2nd cent. BC), *AVI* 78.2f. (2nd/3rd cent. BC), see Lattimore 217. Cicero contrasted in several passages Solon *IEG* 21 (quoted in n. 1b *ad fin.*) with Ennius *Epigr.* 46 Courtney *nemo me lacrimis decoret nec funera fletu/faxit. cur? volito vivos per ora virum*, cf. also Hor. *C.* 2.10.21–4.

23.3b. ξείνων The term covers the whole semantic field from 'brotherly friend' to 'stranger', see Gow on Theoc. 5.66, J. Pinsent in *Mélanges E. Delebeque*, Aix-en-Provance 1983, 313–8, Edwards on *Il.* 17.151–2. Here perhaps a friend from old times.

23.3c. φιλαίτατε is a rare superlative for the common φίλτατος. It first occurs in Xen. *HG* 7.3.8, from P. in Theoc. (who never has φίλτατος) 7.98 ὁ τὰ πάντα φιλαίτατος of Aratus called ξεῖνος in 119, then in Dioscurus *GDRK* 42.4.31, 21.15, epigr. 288.13–4 Cougny ἑτάρων ὁ φιλαίτατος ἄλλων/Πάτροκλος, cf. Call. *HyDel.* 58 φιλαίτερον .. υἷα, a comparative trivialised in Nonn. *D.* (5x). Cf. Homeric γεραίτατος (also [Theoc.] 25.48) and from παλαιός Call. *SH* 274.4 παλαίτερον οὔνομα, fr. 66.8–9 παλαίτατα . . ./οἰκία, see McLennan on *HyJov.* 40 and on other irregular superlatives Pfeiffer on Call. frr. 93.3, 535, Hollis on *id. Hec.* fr. 139.

---

[2] See Schwyzer i, 582–3, Vian on A.R. 3.949, Hutchinson on Aesch. *ScTh* 712.

23.3d. ξείνων . . φιλαίτατε 'dearest of friends' is an affectionate address meant to counterbalance the speaker's refusal to weep, cf. Call. *HE* 42.2 ξείνων λῷστε. It varies the Homeric address *Il.* 13.249 = 19.315 = *Od.* 24.517 = Archil. *IEG* 168.3 φίλταθ' ἑταίρων, relying on *Il.* 17.584, *al.* ξείνων φίλτατος. Cf. in address *Il.* 24.748 Ἕκτορ . . . φίλτατε παίδων ~ 24.762, *Od.* 1.158 = 19.350 φίλε ξεῖνε, Soph. *OC* 1552 = Eur. *Cycl.* 418 φίλτατε ξένων, *CEG* 530.4 (m. 4th cent. BC; deceased to a friend) φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν (a common form of address in tragedy), *IMEG* 5.11–2 (2nd cent. BC; deceased to wanderer) φέριστε/ξεῖνε, *GVI* 1332.1 (1st/2nd cent. BC; deceased to wanderer) ξένε φίλτατε, Theoc. 15.74 = 24.40 φίλ' ἀνδρῶν (15.52 ἄνερ φίλε), further *Od.* 14.301 = 21.388 δειλὲ ξείνων, *Od.* 14.443 δαιμόνιε ξείνων. ὦ ξένε was apparently first employed by 'Simon.' *FGE* 11.1, 22b.1 and became popular with Hellenistic epigrammatists, see Seelbach 47. On *Anredeformen* in general see E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address, from Herodotus to Lucian*, Oxford 1996, esp. 135–8 and on the high-styled genitive in these expressing the uniqueness of the addressee, see K-G i, 339.

23.3e. ἔγνως 'experienced'.

23.4a. πολλὰ . . ἔγνως/καλά, κακῶν δ' αὖ σοι μοῖραν ἔνειμε θεός Contrast Asclep. *HE* 33.5–6 φεῦ . . καὶ σέ, Βότρυος φίλος παῖ,/ὅσᾶν ἄμοιρος ἡδονῶν ἀπώλευ and cf. *GVI* 1395.2 (2nd cent. AD) πολλὰ μὲν ἐσθλὰ παθὼν | φρεσί, πολλὰ δὲ λυγρά; more neutral *GVI* 1028.5–6 (2nd/3rd cent. BC; a young boy) ὑπ' Ἅιδην/κεῖμαι, μήτε καλῶν μήτε κακῶν μέτοχος, *SEG* 31.846.2 (3rd cent. AD; a baby died) οὐ κακὸν οὐδὲ ἀγαθὸν γνούς, βίος ὅττι φέρει. — That life is a mixture of good and evil fortune is an old assertion: *Il.* 24.527–33, *Od.* 4.236–7, 8.63, 15.487–8, Hes. *WD* 669, *Theog.* 570, 602, 906, Stesich.? *PMGF* S 150.4, Solon *IEG* 13.63, Theogn. 192, 355–60, Bacch. 5.50–5, Soph. *Trach.* 126f., Eur. *Hec.* 57–8, A.R. 4.1165–67, Call. *Hec.* fr. 115 with Hollis ad loc., Anon. *HE* 33.1–2, Q.S. 7.9–10, *AVI* 39.5–6 (2nd cent. AD). The typical sympathy of the wayfarer is here refuted on the grounds of the old topos.

23.4b. μοῖραν ἔνειμε θεός i.e. Zeus. The phrase might echo Mimn. *IEG* 1.10 (οὕτως ἀργαλέον) γῆρας ἔθηκε θεός/, cf. also Bacch. 5.50–1 θεός/μοῖραν . . καλῶν ἔπορεν, Plato *Rep.* 364b θεοὶ . . . δυστυχίας τε καὶ βίον κακὸν ἔνειμαν. Asclep. *HE* 19.4 ends an erotic (and later Philod. *GPh* 24.4 an epideictic) epigram with θεός/.

Fr. 24

This fragment is classified in Stobaeus' chapter περὶ ναυτιλίας καὶ ναυαγίου and it is ascribed to the *Epigrams* of P. Wil. 1924 i, 115, Powell on (his) fr. 10, *HE* ii, 478 and D. L. Page, *Epigr. Graeca*, OCT 1975, 75 ("mancum videtur, siquidem epigramma") noticed the unlikelihood of these lines being part of an epigram. Earlier Reitzenstein 1893, 179 wanted to ascribe them to a "short gnomic elegy" apparently with an allegorical meaning 'even in the most adverse circumstances there is hope'. This looks unlikely. A sea-storm description was surmised by Webster 41 ("a storm in the Argonauts' voyage") and Zanker 1987, 102 n. 3, but ποτε indicates that this is not a case of emergency. Kuchenmüller 68, for whom the lines are a complete epigram, ingeniously suggested them to be a riddle about Rhodes, which according to a tradition suddenly appeared from the sea, Pind. *O.* 7.55f., *al.* He also considered Anaphe (69 n. 1), an island bearing associations with the Argonauts and Thessaly (Craik 164, Vian iii, 67). It seems more likely, as G-P hold, that the fragment is a comment of a sailor in the open sea ("Providence will ultimately bring them in sight of land") such as *Od.* 12.403–4 = 14.301–2 (sea-storm) οὐδέ τις ἄλλη/φαίνετο γαιάων, ἀλλ' οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα; *Campbell compared A.R. 4.1245f., 1256f., see on the *topos* Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 131–4. Such statements often foreshadow events of terror for those at sea.

24.2a. αἰψηρῶν Most editors since Kayser print the banal λαιψηρῶν (*Il.* 14.17 = 15.620 λιγέων ἀνέμων λαιψηρὰ κέλευθα/, see Livrea on A.R. 4.241). λαιψηρός is a variant of αἰψηρός in *Il.* 20.276, *Od.* 2.257 (4.103) and αἰψηρά of λαιψηρά in *Il.* 10.358. αἰψηρός of winds is rarer, but possible, cf. Hes. *Theog.* 379 Βορέην τ' αἰψηροκέλευθον, Pind. fr. 94b.16–7 Ζεφύρου . . . πνοάς/αἰψηράς, Epica Adesp. *CA* 1.9 (of a dog Βορῆς), Q.S. 8.184 ἀνέμων ῥιπῇσιν . . αἰψηροῖσι, 4.349. Wil. 1924 ii, 183 n. 1 and G-P in *HE* ii, 478, who noted that ephelcystic -ν in πάρεστιν is in favour of αἰψηρῶν, were probably right in defending it.

24.2b. ἀνέμων . . . τέμενος 'dominion of the winds', i.e. the sea. τέμενος is used metaphorically, as Aesch. *Pers.* 365 (sky) τέμενος αἰθέρος, Pind. *P.* 2.2 (Syracuse) τέμενος Ἄρεος, *ibid.* 4.56–7 (Egypt) Νεί-/λοιο πρὸς πῖον τέμενος Κρονίδα. Elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry it always denotes land dedicated to a god. For the doxographic belief

that the sea is the seat and realm of the winds cf. *Il.* 21.334–5 (Hera) Ζεφύροιο καὶ ἀργεστᾶο Νότοιο/εἴσομαι ἐξ ἁλόθεν χαλεπὴν ὄρσουσα θύελλαν ~ Q.S. 5.637–8, Xenoph. 21 B 30.1f. D-K πηγὴ δ' ἐστὶ θάλασσ' ὕδατος, πηγὴ δ' ἀνέμοιο·/[. . .]/ἀλλὰ μέγας πόντος γενέτωρ νεφέων ἀνέμων τε/καὶ ποταμῶν with Heitsch ad loc., Emped. 31 B 50 D-K Ἶρις δ' ἐκ πελάγους ἄνεμον φέρει ἢ μέγαν ὄμβρον, expressions like *Il.* 2.396–7 κύματα . . ./παντοίων ἀνέμων (with genitive of cause, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 713), Menecr. Ephes. *SH* 546, Nic. *Alex.* 171–2 θάλασσαν,/ἥν τε καὶ ἀτμεύειν ἀνέμοις πόρεν Ἐννοσίγαιος (with M. Geymonat, *Acme* 23 (1970), 140–1), Lyr. Adesp. *CA* 33 (Ῥοδίοις ἀνέμοις), Hor. *C.* 3.3.4–5 *Auster/dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,* Tib. 1.9.9 *freta per parentia ventis.*

Fr. 25

This quatrain is transmitted as a paegnion by Stobaeus and its obscure meaning would justify such a categorisation, but we cannot be sure that P. actually published it as such. Some of the proposed interpretations are worth noting only as specimens of extreme oddity. Kayser 47–8 translated it with the impossible "cantus sive poesis me, si alnus essem, potius moverat id de loco duceret, quam rusticus indoctus, qui ligone uteretur ad exscindendum me" and saw "procul dubio" a reference to Orpheus. Bach 41 thought that P. here confirms his immortality: no rustic will chop me down, but a literate etc., "ut paucis absolvamur: Carmina et libri mei nunquam peribunt". He was followed by Couat 76–7 who added his own "I shall live!" to complete the sense, and Cessi 1908, 141–2. Maass 1895a, iii–vii proposed the verses to be a notice for an alder-stick, a poetic symbol as in Theoc. 7.43–4, 128–9, expressing the hope that a *poeta doctus*, not a rustic, will take hold of it.[3] Reitzenstein 1893, 179 compared Alcm. *PMGF* 16:

> οὐκ ἦς ἀνὴρ ἀγρεῖος οὐ-
> δὲ σκαιὸς οὐδὲ †παρὰ σοφοῖ-
> σιν† οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸς γένος,
> Ἐρυσιχαῖος οὐδὲ ποιμήν,
> ἀλλὰ Σαρδίων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν

[3] This *apophoreton* idea was espoused by Nowacki 56–7, Butler-Barber 17 n. 1, J. van Sickle, *QUCC* n.s. 19 (1975), 59 n. 61 and Bowie 75.

and drew the conclusion that here speaks a lady who rejects the love of a rustic for that of an erudite poet.[4] Diehl and Latacz 1985 were attracted by it and Wil. 1924 i, 116 pushed it to extremes by suggesting that the speaker is Bittis herself. F. W. Schmidt, *SO* 7 (1928), 30–2 accepted a woman as speaker and thought that her name is the unattested Κλήθρη.

There have also been those who advocate a link with two known and one unknown work of P. Schweizer 55–6 in a brief *Anhang* suspected a Homeric riddle alluding to the alders that Odysseus cut down in *Od.* 5.259. He therefore postulated a connection with *Hermes*. His idea was revived by Ch. Carriga, *Lexis* (1989), 79–87. Cazzaniga 238–48 saw literary criticism intended and related the epigram to the story of Erysichthon in Call., identifying the alder with the sacred αἴγειρος in *HyDem.* 37 and the rustic with Erysichthon storming the grove to chop down its trees. In conclusion, the goddess personified in her sacred tree declares her preference for an erudite poet to a rustic. However, the equation of alder and oak is in the air and the sacrilege of Erysichthon in connection with Demeter is not attested before Call. McKay 1978 interpreted αἱρήσει as 'comprehend' and conjoined ἐξ ὀρέων with ἀγροιώτης, but reached the conclusion that the epigram refers to a lost work of P. named Κλήθρη, to which Call. T. 7.10 would allude, should δρῦς be supplemented there. Before him G. Coppola (*Cirene e il nuovo Callimaco*, Bologna 1935, 139–45) followed E. Maass in reading βληθρήν 'tender' for κλήθρην and deemed that here speaks the oak missing in Call. *l.l.*

C. Wachsmuth suggested that κλήθρην stands for a writing tablet made of alder wood. Such a metonymy was paralleled by Kuchenmüller 61 with Eur. *IA* 39 and *Hipp.* 1253–54 where πεύκη means 'writing tablet', cf. also Plato *Laws* 741c κυπαριττίνας μνήμας ~ Longinus *De subl.* 4.6.[5] Bing 1986 tried to sweep aside an objection by Wil. drawing attention to writing tablets of alder wood from the

---

[4] Not long afterwards, Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 31 (1896), 201 n. 2 appeared less confident: "Daß ich in meinem "Epigramm und Skolion" oft überschritten habe, ist mir wohl bewußt..... Ich würde jetzt schwerlich das Fragment des Philetas... mit Sicherheit deuten wollen". The Alcman-fragment is not of much help. It is part of a *partheneion*, a song sung by a chorus of maidens expressing their preference for an *asteios* husband from Sardis in the form of a typical negative priamel, see Latacz 1985, 81–2, *PMGF* i, 72 and for the motif cf. [Theoc.] 20.2f.

[5] The idea found broad support, cf. Bing 1986, 222f., *id.* 1988, 31–3, K.-H. Stanzel, *Liebende Hirten. Theokrits Bukolik und die Alexandrinische Poesie*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1995, 351–3, *LSJ Suppl.* s.v. κλῆθρα and Pöhlmann 254–5.

2nd cent. AD found in Vindolanda near Hadrian's wall in northern England. Still, the evidence comes from a place whose wet climate favours the alder, which is a rare tree in Greece. A talking book raises no suspicion in the 'book-culture' of the Hellenistic times, but there is no real testimony for alders used to produce writing tablets in Greece.

The labyrinth of interpretations is due to the deliberately confusing, even contradictory elements constituting this epigram. ἐξ ὀρέων can be conjoined just as well with both ἀγροιώτης and αἱρήσει. The latter can mean 'win over', 'take away (uproot)' or 'comprehend'. κλήθρην is placed where one would expect an attribute to μακέλην. The latter has been interpreted as a tree, a woman, a writing-tablet/book or suspected as corrupt. αἰρόμενος is a pseudo-parallel to αἱρήσει. Efforts to restore a monosemantic flow of thoughts ended up in numerous interventions in the text.[6] The first two lines read well in their 'physical' meaning: no dull-witted rustic will remove me, an alder, from the mountains etc.[7] It is only in the last two verses that the true meaning reveals itself: not a rustic, but an erudite, who has acquired broad knowledge with much toil. Stobaeus' classification in περὶ λόγου καὶ γραμμάτων seems justified. Literary criticism is intended. This technique of 'tail-surprise' is well-known in the epigram. It would suffice to point to Asclep. *HE* 32 as to whether the speaker is a woman or Antimachus' book: Λυδὴ καὶ γένος εἰμὶ καὶ οὔνομα [. . .] τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λυδήν,/τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου;.

Which is the symbolism of the first two lines in this respect? The key-words are αἱρήσει 'understand' and κλήθρην as a beautiful tree growing in the valleys, not on the hillsides: no unlettered rustic from the mountains will understand me, an alder, one who raises his mat-

---

[6] Hartung 33 read βλωθρήν 'tall', a Homeric gloss revived in Hellenistic times (Page on Anon. *FGE* 59.1), E. Maass βληθρήν 'tender', R. Holland, *PhW* 45 (1925), 14 even κλῆθρον 'as a doorbar' of a laurel that the poet had allegedly planted. Wil. held that "κλήθρην ein Adjektiv zu μακέλην verbirgt" and is therefore corrupt, but declined to make an uncertain emendation. He persuaded Webster 42. R. F. W. Schmidt, *SO* 7 (1928), 30–2 comparing Goethe's *Gefunden* proposed μακέλῃ. Older proposals are recorded in Cazzaniga 258 n. 1.

[7] In this reading ἐξ ὀρέων refers to αἱρήσει, cf. Call. *HE* 36.1–2 τὸν αἰπόλον ἥρπασε Νύμφη/ἐξ ὄρεος. The place to cut down a tree is naturally the mountains, cf. *Il.* 1.235, 12.132, 13.390 = 16.483, 16.634, 17.743, *HHAphr.* 266, Simon. *IEG* 11.2–3, [Hes.] *Scut.* 374f., Call. fr. 194.34–5, A.R. 3.858, 3.969, 4.1682, Anon. *FGE* 77.2, Virg. *A.* 2.626.

tock, but etc. κλήθρην in this reading as a noble urban tree is a qualitative evaluation of μέ in 1. This is a talking book. The epigram seems to be a fictitious book-inscription. These became a fashion in Hellenistic times.[8] They differ from this epigram in the fact that these are not written by the author of the book himself. However, Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 961 may have been written by Posidippus to preface a collection of epigrams in which he was a contributor. This epigram seems to draw the reader's attention to the erudite and allusive nature of the work it prefaces.

Which work this is, we cannot say. The author seems to imply that an uneducated reader will not understand a book which is a κλήθρη. The notoriously tall alder may contrast to the moderate size of that book. A small scale work of P. praised by Call. T. 7a is *Demeter*, but Kuchenmüller's 62 suggestion that this piece prefaces a collection of paegnia by P., espoused by von Blumenthal 2168 and Cataudella 402–4, seems likelier.[9] An image alluding to the qualities of a tree is an unusual poetological symbolism, but it may have had a reproductive impact on Call. T. 7a.10 adopting the same poetic principles, if Housmann's δρῦν] is correct.[10] The alder metaphor employed by P. may be a significant precedent here.

---

[8] Cf. Asclep. *l.c.* probably prefacing a copy of Antim. *Lyde, id. HE* 28 on Erinna *Distaff*, Call. *HE* 55 on Creophylus *Oechalias Halosis*, *HE* 56 on Arat. *Phaenomena*, Leon. Tar. *HE* 101 on the same work, [Theoc.] *AP* 9.434 (epigr. [27] Gow) on an early collection of Theoc.'s poems and later Artemidorus *FGE* 1 on his collection of bucolic poems or Antip. Thess. *GPh* 31 on a booklet he composed for Piso, see Page on Anon. *FGE* 32, Bing 1988, 29f. with a discussion on the talking book.

[9] *Alii* saw *alia*: H. Stadtmüller, *BPhW* 15 (1897), 451 held that P. addressed with this epigram Theoc. and received an answer in 7.40, that Simichidas even in bucolic is inferior to P. R. Herzog, *Philologus* 78 (1923), 418 interpreted the piece as a "dichterische Selbstbekenntnis in bukolischer Umgebung". Later Puelma 1960, 163 postulated a "Selbstbiographisches Initiationsgedicht hesiodischer Tradition" by P. Bucolic was also detected by Couat 76–7. Bowie 75 ("an extract rather than a complete poem"; *contra*: McKay 1978, 36–7, Hutchinson 84) conceded that it does not offer any bucolic foothold but it might be derived from a "bucolic context", although "that can only be guesswork". G. Giangrande, *AC* 37 (1968), 511 n. 50 and *QUCC* n.s. 12 (1971), 105 n. 34 mistook the rejection of a rustic for a "polemique antibucolique" precursory to that which he detected in Theoc. 7. For Pöhlmann 255 too, P. turns against the improvised bucolic sing-contests, and could not therefore be an author of bucolic poetry himself.

[10] Massimilla 206 drew attention to two Roman passages speaking in favour of it, Val. Flacc. 1.70 (of Triptolemus) *flava quercum damnavit arista* and Claud. *RP* 1.30–1 (Ceres' gifts) *unde datae populis fruges et glande relicta/cesserit inventis Dodonia quercus aristis*. In terms of literary criticism, one might as well compare Call. *Iambi* 4 (fr. 194) and Quirinus' (proverbial?) advice to Horace in a dream, *Sat.* 1.10.34 *in silvam non ligna feras*, see further Spanoudakis 2001, 437f.

Two features in this epigram are striking. First, its studied symmetry. The rustic receives two verses, the literate another two. An adversative ἀλλά signifies the transition from the one to the other. The first receives eleven words, the second another eleven in a correspondence of 7+4 and 7+4. The rustic is in the negative part, the erudite in the positive. Its structure suggests that this is a complete piece. It turns the principle of κόσμος ἐπέων it purports to convey into practice. The second feature of this epigram is its polemical tone. This takes the form of the common rhetorical formula οὐκ etc. ἀλλά etc., cf. Xenoph. *IEG* 1.21f. denouncing songs about fights of mythical creatures in a symposium, and esp. Anacr. *IEG* 2:

οὐ φιλέω, ὃς κρητῆρι παρὰ πλέῳ οἰνοποτάζων
  νείκεα καὶ πόλεμον δακρυόεντα λέγει,
ἀλλ' ὅστις Μουσέων τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρ' Ἀφροδίτης
  συμμίσγων ἐρατῆς μνήσκεται εὐφροσύνης.

The rustic is downgraded with three disparaging attributes: he is ἐξ ὀρέων, ἀποφώλιος ἀγροιώτης and αἱρόμενος μακέλην. These find three positive parallels full of erudition in ἐπέων εἰδὼς κόσμον, πολλὰ μογήσας and μύθων παντοίων οἶμον ἐπιστάμενος. P.'s polemical tone is related to the opposing trends in the conception of poetry in his days. *Leptotes* had to fight its way through.[11] This epigram is one of the pieces of evidence indicating that Call.'s aesthetic was before him propounded by P.

25.1a. μέ is supplemented by κλῆθρην in 2.

25.1b. τις is pejorative, 'not just any'.

25.1c. ἐξ ὀρέων refers to ἀγροιώτης, cf. Q.S. 1.63 ἀπ' οὔρεος ἀγροιῶται ~ 7.505–6, Opp. *Hal.* 3.386 (derogatorily of a hunter) ὀρέστερος ἀγροιώτης/. For the rustic from the mountains failing to appreciate the value of an alder cf. the shepherds in the mountains failing to respect the beauty of a hyacinth in Sappho fr. 105b οἴαν τὰν ὐάκινθον ἐν ὤρεσι ποίμενες ἄνδρες/πόσσι καταστείβοισι, χάμαι δέ τε πόρφυρον ἄνθος. . . . The phrase is usually placed at the beginning of a hexa-

[11] See K. Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos*, Berlin ²1966, then Gow ii, xxii and Ll-J ii, 236, Hutchinson 14. Papanghelis 17–8 expressed reservations due to lack of evidence and Cameron 1995, 263f. (ch. X) tried to refute the *opinio communis*, cf. also Lightfoot 16f. M. J. Edwards, *Latomus* 53 (1994), 806–12 argued for an "unusual and by no means authoritative position of Callimachus in Greek poetry".

meter, but cf. *A.R. 1.1100, 2.400, 976, *Arat. 118 and see Campbell on Q.S. 12.410.

25.1d. ἀποφώλιος is an Odyssean word (4x) of obscure etymology (*LFrE* s.v., Hoekstra on *Od.* 14.212), then Hes. fr. 31.2 (= *Od.* 11.249), Eur. fr. 996, Nic. *Alex.* 524. It bears implications of poor intelligence in *Od.* 5.182 (Calypso to Odysseus) ἦ δὴ ἀλιτρός γ' ἐσσὶ καὶ οὐκ ἀποφώλια εἰδώς, 8.177 νόον δ' ἀποφώλιός ἐσσι (see *DGE* s.v. II.1). As with ἀποβώμιος (Seaford on Eur. *Cycl.* 364) or with ἀποθύμιος (*Il.* 14.261, Hes. *WD* 710, cf. *Il.* 1.562 ἀπὸ θυμοῦ) the Alexandrians probably understood it as ἀπὸ φωλεοῦ, cf. Σ *Od.* 5.182 (I.261 Dindorf) ἀποφώλια· ἀπαίδευτα. φωλεοὶ γὰρ τὰ παιδευτήρια, Hsch. α 6798 and see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 68.2 and Theodoridis on Phot. *Lex.* α 2719 ἀποφώλιον· . . . ἀπαίδευτον, ἄτεχνον. On such formations see in general Schwyzer ii, 448.

25.1e. ἀγροιώτης is a *metri gratia* Homeric formation of ἀγρότης, see Risch 35. ἀγροιώτης (*Il.* 3x, *Od.* 2x) disparagingly refers to inferior intelligence in *Od.* 21.85 (Antinous to Eumaeus) νήπιοι ἀγροιῶται, ἐφημέρια φρονέοντες and to lack of education in Sappho fr. 57 †τίς δ' ἀγροΐωτις θέλγει νόον . . ./ἀγροΐωτιν ἐπεμμένα στόλαν† . . ./οὐκ ἐπισταμένα τὰ βράκε' ἕλκην ἐπὶ τῶν σφύρων; Ar. *Nub.* 646 ὡς ἄγροικος εἶ καὶ δυσμαθής ('boorish', even 'stupid' in Ar., see Taillardat 13 n. 3), Hsch. α 817 ἀγροικότατον· ἀπαιδευτότατον. In literary terms, contrast Arist. *Rhet.* 1410b7 τὰ ἀστεῖα καὶ εὐδοκιμοῦντα of diction and cf. Latin *rusticus* (see Hutchinson 282), Hor. *Ars poet.* 272–3 *ego et vos/scimus inurbanum lepido seponere dicto*, Plato *Symp.* 194c (Socrates to Agathon) οὐ μεντἂν καλῶς ποιοίην . . . περὶ σοῦ τι ἐγὼ ἄγροικον δοξάζων. Both ἀποφώλιος and ἀγροιώτης are Homeric, here conjoined in a novel expression.

25.2a. αἱρήσει here means 'understand, comprehend in full depth', a colouring of the meaning 'conquest, take hold of', see *DGE* s.v. A.III.3 citing Plato *Phileb.* 17e, 20d, *Polit.* 282d and McKay 1978, 38–9 citing Soph. *Phil.* 863, Plato *Phd.* 81b, *Tim.* 51a. He compares similar nuances of λαμβάνω, ἅπτομαι and συναρπάζω to conclude that "any verb of physical grasping might naturally be used intellectually".

25.2b. αἱρήσει . . . αἱρόμενος is a pseudo-repetition superficially like the ones abounding in epic (Fehling 1969, 134f.), cf. *Il.* 1.595–6 ~ 14.222–3 μείδησεν . . ./μειδήσασα, 20.61–2 ἔδεισεν . . ./δείσας, 21.395–6 ἀνῆκεν/. . . ἀνῆκας. To judge by the faked Phlious-anaphora in fr. 19,

P. might have affected these. Cf., in Hellenistic verse, Hermesian. *CA* 7.94 εὗρε . . . εὑρόμενος, Call. *HE* 59.1–2 μανεὶς . ./. . . ἐμάνη μανίαν, Asclep. *HE* 22.1–3 ἀποπτάς/. . . οὐ πέτομαι,/φιλέων . . . φιληθείς, 4.1–4 ἐχούσῃ/. . ./. . ἔχον . . ./. . . ἔχῃ, later *EG* 994.1–2 Kaibel (2nd/3rd cent. AD) Μέμν]ων οἶδε λαλεῖν . . . οἶδέ τ[ε] σιγᾶν,/εἰδὼς καὶ φωνῆς νεῦρα καὶ ἡσυχίας. This kind of repetition was disliked by Brunck 234 ("Ingratum est αἱρήσει – αἱρόμενος. Forte scripserat ἀμφιτεμὼν μακέλῃ") and B. A. van Groningen, *Poésie Verbale*, Amsterdam 1953, 71 n. 6: "man (muß) darüber klar sein, daß die Alten solche Wiederholungen nicht wie wir mieden", Kroll on Cat. 55.18 *tenent* . ./. . . *tenet*, see K-G ii, 99–100, Schwyzer ii, 388.

25.2c. κλῆθρην The alder is a rare tree in Greek literature.[12] It comes up 2x in the *Od.*, in 5.64 surrounding Calypso's cave and 5.239 as material for Odysseus to build his boat, from whence it was probably brought to P.'s attention. Theophr. *HP* 3.14.2 says that it is a lofty tree (φύσει δὲ ὀρθοφυές) growing in damp places (φύεται δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐφύδροις, ἀλλόθι δ' οὐδαμοῦ). Crucially, it belongs to the trees growing not on the mountains, but only on plains, Theophr. *HP* 3.3.1 (κλῆθρα among those trees which (φύεται) ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις). A rustic from the mountains would not recognise it. Since its picturesque Odyssean days the alder was regarded as a beautiful and robust tree, cf. Philostr. Jun. *Imag.* 6.2 (Orpheus singing) and Cat. 64.289 = Virg. *E.* 6.33 *proceras* . . . *alnos*, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 13.790.

25.2d. αἱρόμενος μακέλην is a generic description of the hard working but uneducated rustic. The tough job of digging is often contrasted to the delicacy of literate efforts, cf. Ar. fr. 232 ὅστις αὐλοῖς καὶ λύραισι κατατέτριμμαι χρώμενος/εἶτά με σκάπτειν κελεύεις; with K-A ad loc. *cl.* Men. *Dysc.* 766 τρυφερὸς ὢν δίκελλαν ἔλαβες, ἔσκαψας, cf. also Ps-Phoc. 158 εἰ δέ τις οὐ δεδάηκε τέχνης, σκάπτοιτο δικέλλῃ, Diog. Laert. 7.169. μακέλλα 'mattock' is a Homeric technical term occurring only in a simile of a man irrigating his orchard in *Il.* 21.259, in a passage containing six hapaxes in six verses. It is an implement for digging and breaking up the soil (Arat. 7–8 ὅτε βῶλος ἀρίστη/βουσί τε καὶ μακέλῃσι, Nonn. *D.* 4.255, *al.* πεδοσκαφέεσσι μακέλλαις), not cutting down a tree, cf. also Anon. *AP* 16.202.3–4 ἀγροϊώτης/. . ἐποτρύνων ἔργα φυτοσκαφίης. It is always related to humble activities and persons, cf. Hes. *WD* 469–70 ὁ δὲ τυτθὸς

---

[12] See Murr 17, Stadler, *RE* VI.1.470–2 s.v. Erle, Gennadios 516, J. Andrè, *Lexique des termes de botanique en latin*, Paris 1956, 24, Meiggs 108–9.

ὄπισθε/δμῶος ἔχων μακέλην etc., A.R. 1.1533, [Mosch.] *Megara* 94, 108, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 71.3, Antiph. *GPh* 42.3, see Livrea on A.R. *l.c.*, Gow on Theoc. 16.32 (a wealthy leader inimical to the Muses dies without posthumous fame) ὡσεί τις μακέλᾳ τετυλωμένος ἔνδοθι χεῖρας. Here Theoc. has P. in mind. For the epic rarity of αἴρω (~ ἀείρω, ἄρνυμι) see Hopkinson on Call. *HyDem.* 34.

25.3a. ἐπέων . . κόσμον In *Od.* 8.489 Odysseus praises Demodocus for singing λίην . . κατὰ κόσμον. Epic characters talk κατὰ κόσμον (e.g. *HHHerm.* 433) or οὐ κατὰ κόσμον (e.g. *Od.* 8.179) and Thersites in *Il.* 2.213 ἔπεα . . . ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ᾔδη, see Ebeling s.v. κόσμος I.b, in Hellenistic poetry Livrea on A.R. 4.360. For ἐπέων . . κόσμον cf. Solon *IEG* 1.2, Parmen. 28 B 8.52 D-K, Democr. 68 B 21 D-K (Homer) ἐπέων κόσμον ἐτεκτήνατο παντοίων, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 20.3 (ποιηταὶ ἀκανθολόγοι) ἐπέων κόσμον λελυγισμένον ἀσκήσαντες (which may be indebted to P., cf. *All. Test.* Dub. 2), then Simon. *IEG* 11.23–4 (invocation to Muse) τόνδ[ε μελ]ίφρονα κ[όσμον ἀο]ιδῆς/ἡμετ]έρης with C. O. Pavese, *ZPE* 107 (1995), 15 (add Orph. *Arg.* 252, then Theogn. 242–3), Pind. fr. 194.2–3 ποικίλον/κόσμον αὐδάεντα λόγων, Simias *Ov.* 10 κόσμον . . ῥυθμῶν, further *Od.* 11.367 μορφὴ ἐπέων, Hes. *WD* 403 ~ *HHAp.* 20 νομὸς ἐπέων, Pind. *O.* 3.8–9 ἐπέων τε θέσιν/. . . συμμεῖξαι πρεπόντως, Posid.? *HE* 24.2 τ]ῶν ἐπέων σοφίῃ, Nicarch. *HE* 3.3 (Homer's) τεκτοσύνη ἐπέων, see Nünlist 90–7. κόσμος in Arist. *Poet.* 1452b2 is a literary value but more information is prohibited by a lacuna in the text. "It must refer to some sort of ornament. At *R(het.)* 1404a34, b37 and Isocr. 9.9 κόσμος and κεκοσμημένη λέξις include all poetical and abnormal use of language", Lucas on 1457b33. The ἐπέων κόσμος here refers to the form, i.e. the arrangement and articulation of the content (the μύθων οἶμος of the next verse).

25.3b. πολλὰ μογήσας is a stock-phrase in epic referring to the toils in the battlefield (Janko on *Il.* 15.235), or to Odysseus' adventures (Garvie on *Od.* 6.175–7), cf. also Hes. *Theog.* 967, Theogn. 71. Invertedly, the phrase refers here to the toils of erudition to be injected into a learned poem. Bach 42 referred to [Manetho] *Apot.* 1.8 (I will sing of the stars) νύκτας ἄυπνος ἐὼν καὶ ἐν ἤμασι πολλὰ μογήσας. P. himself was acclaimed for his learned industry. For the erudite poet's πόνος cf. Theoc. 7.51 μελύδριον ἐξεπόνασα (note the diminutive), Hermesian. *CA* 7.35 (Mimnermus discovered the pentameter) πολλὸν ἀνατλάς, Asclep. *HE* 28.1 γλυκὺς πόνος Ἠρίννης, Call. *HE* 55.1 τοῦ Σαμίου πόνος εἰμί, A.R. 4.1775–76 ἐπὶ κλυτὰ

πείραθ' ἱκάνω/ὑμετέρων καμάτων, Herodas 8.71 τὰ μέλεα . . . τοὺς ἐμοὺς μόχθους, Meleag. *HE* 129.3, Bion fr. 8.3, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 31.1–2 βίβλον/μικρὴν . . . πονησάμενος, 103.1.[13] In *id. GPh* 85.1 πόνος refers to a work of art. Outside this context, similar terms may refer to the composition of a text/speech without any further implications, cf. Thuc. 3.38.2 τὸ εὐπρεπὲς τοῦ λόγου ἐκπονήσας, Long. *Praef.* 3 τέτταρας βίβλους ἐξεπονησάμην.

25.3c. εἰδὼς . . ./. . . ἐπιστάμενος P.'s poetic ideal requires the poet to work hard (πολλὰ μογήσας) and to know: erudition is the fundament of good poetry. Hermesian. *CA* 7.22 praised Hesiod as πάσης ἤρανον ἱστορίης. Call. in Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην fr. 460 praised Aratus ὡς πολυμαθῆ καὶ ἄριστον ποιητήν and was himself praised as πολυίστωρ, εἴ τις ἄλλος in Strabo T. 68 Pf., see Pfeiffer 1968, 125 with n. 5. The old perception that (oral) poetry is a gift granted by the Muses or a god is here inverted. For the εἰδώς poet cf. *Il.* 7.241, Hes. *Theog.* 27–8, Theogn. 669–70, Antiphan. *PCG* 207.6, Call. *HE* 30, fr. 64.10?, Leon. Tar. *HE* 58.6, Alex. Aet. *CA* 4.2, Adesp. Frust. Auct. *SH* 1153, Theoc. 15.97 πολύιδρις ἀοιδός, 146, the Salmakis-epigram 50 (2nd cent. BC) Ζηνόδοτον τραγικῶν ἴδριν . . ἐπέων, *GVI* 697.5 (3rd cent. AD) ἀ|νὴρ ἴδρις Μουσῶν. For ἐπιστάμενος, a technical term for the 'knowledge' of the poet, cf. *Od.* 21.406, *HHHerm.* 479, Archil. *IEG* 1.2, Solon *IEG* 13.52, Plato *Symp.* 223d τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνδρὸς εἶναι κωμῳδίαν καὶ τραγῳδίαν ἐπίστασθαι ποιεῖν, Theoc. 17.7, 113, Posid.? *HE* 24.4, Theodor. *HE* 14.1 and see U. Dubielzieg, *RhM* n.s. 138 (1995), 343–4 on Call. fr. 1.8. For the two synonyms cf. Anon. *HE* 56.1–2 οἶδα φιλεῖν . . ἐπίσταμαι . . ./μισεῖν and in general see fr. 4.2e.

25.4a. μύθων παντοίων Cf. *Il.* 20.248–9 στρεπτὴ δὲ γλῶσσ' ἐστὶ βροτῶν, πολέες δ' ἔνι μῦθοι/παντοῖοι, ἐπέων δὲ πολὺς νομὸς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα, *Od.* 22.347–8 (Phemius) θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσὶν οἴμας/παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν. If ἔπη are the form, μῦθος is the narrative. The two are juxtaposed in *Od.* 4.597–8 μύθοισιν ἔπεσσί τε σοῖσιν ἀκούων/τέρπομαι and in 11.561. The phrase stresses the notion of erudition.

25.4b. μύθων . . οἶμον οἶμος is Homeric but cf. in this sense *HHHerm.* 451 ἀγλαὸς οἶμος ἀοιδῆς, Pind. *O.* 9.47 ἐπέων . . . οἶμον λιγύν, *ibid.* 1.110, Aesch. *Ag.* 1154, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 422–3 (see Mastronarde on Eur.

[13] See G-P on Asclep. *HE* 28.1, Kannicht on Eur. *Hel.* 204–9, Schwinge 10–1, Papanghelis 43–4 and on Latin *labor* see Lyne on *Ciris* 99 *ad fin.*

Phoen. 911), Call. *HyJov.* 78 λύρης εὖ εἰδότας οἴμους, ambivalent in fr. 1.27 δίφρον ἐλ]ῶν (ἐλ]ᾶν Pf., but see A. Kerkhecker, *ZPE* 11 (1996), 126) μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, further Bacch. 19.1–2 κέλευθος/ ἀμβροσίων μελέων, Hermesian. *CA* 7.94 (Socrates) λόγων πολλὰς εὑρόμενος διόδους, *GVI* 1001.7 (Rhodes, *c.* 100 BC) βύβλου πάσης ἐδάην ἰθεῖαν ἀταρπόν, *EG* 878.6 Kaibel (*c.* 269 AD) = *FGrH* 100 T 4.6 (Dexippus) εὕρατο παντοίην ἱστορίης ἀτραπόν, Musae. 175 πολυπλανέων ἐπέων . . . κελεύθους.[14] The ancient form of οἶμος was aspirated, see C. J. Ruijgh, *Lingua* 44 (1978), 18, Braswell on Pind. *P.* 4.248(a), Massimilla on Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.27 *ad fin.*

II. *Philitas' Epigrams Collection*

Suid. T. 1 says that P. ἔγραψεν ἐπιγράμματα καὶ ἐλεγείας καὶ ἄλλα and Stobaeus ascribed two distichs to *Epigrams* (frr. 23.3–4, 24) and frr. 23.1–2 and 25 to *Paegnia.* The two successive distichs of fr. 23 are apparently one unit as an epigram but fr. 24 could hardly be part of another epigram. Most probably, we are dealing with one epigram and fr. 25 characterised as paegnion. From fr. 23 one may deduce that P. contributed to the evolution of the epigram.[15] Bittis might as well be a courtesan in Philitan epigrams. Nevertheless, it is Asclep., called by Σ Theoc. 7.40a (89.7 Wendel) as τὸν ἐπιγραμματογράφον, who seems to have won a name in the field of the epigram. P. is disregarded by Meleager, who spent the last years of his life on Cos. Reitzenstein 1893, 180 and Wil. 1924 i, 115–6 justified the omission by assuming that P. did not publish a separate collection of epigrams. Gutzwiller 1998, 16–7, 45 deemed that P. did not publish a separate book of epigrams but, under the title *Paegnia,* a miscellaneous collection of short elegiac poems which could be descriptively called ἐπιγράμματα. The absence of such a conspicuous poet from Meleager's collection suggests that his epigrams were not published

---

[14] On the imagery see O. Becker, *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frügriechischen Denken,* Wiesbaden 1937, 68f., McLennan on Call. *HyJov.* 78, B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes,* Göttingen [5]1980, 219f., Asper 21f., 46f. and on Call. fr. 1.25–8 in particular F. Williams, *ZPE* 110 (1996), 40–2.

[15] See H. Beckby, *Anthologia Palatina* i, Munich [2]1965, 20–1, *HE* ii, 476, Fraser ii, 859 n. 405, Bulloch in Easterling-Knox 616, Cameron 1993, 3. Hutchinson 21 n. 46 opined that "the epigrams attributed to P. may well be spurious (and late) and he may not have written any epigrams despite Suda φ 332"; *contra*: H. White, *AC* 60 (1991), 214.

in a separate collection on which Meleager could draw and if not published by then one wonders if this ever happened, so that they may have been partially lost by Meleager's days.[16]

The only surviving paegnion is fr. 25 which perhaps prefaced a poem or a collection of poems. Its intriguing meaning justifies this ascription, but one cannot know if it was ever published in a book of *Paegnia.* From the ascriptions of fr. 23 to *Paegnia* and *Epigrams* some have concluded that the one may be an alternative title for the other.[17] This may be true in the sense that an early epigrammatist could describe some of his miniature poems as 'playlets'. However, in view of their distinction in Stobaeus it looks unlikely. The division of fr. 23 might be due to an excision of a previous *Paegnia*-fragment. Arat. wrote *Epigrams* (*SH* 101) and is said by Suidas (= *SH* 111) to have written *Paegnia* as well. The same may be true of Crates Theb. with *Paegnia* (*SH* 347f.) and possibly *Epigrams* (*SH* 369). Suid. ο 254 provides the same information for Homer Sellius (παίγνια δι' ἐπῶν), a grammarian probably of the 2nd cent. BC who wrote εἴδη πλεῖστα. There is hardly anything to be said about the content of P.'s *Paegnia.* Some suggested that they included some *technopaegnia.* The term applies to a very wide range of poems such as ones about lascivious loves, whole comedies, prose-works of exquisite form like the *Encomium of Helen* of Gorgias, the *carmina figurata* and even the bucolic poems of Theoc.[18]

---

[16] A.R. is said by the notation of Ant. Lib. 23 to have written epigrams (A.R.? *FGE* 1 is "a product of a much later age", Cameron 1995, 227–8). These were ignored by Meleager and apparently fell into oblivion. Meleager also ignored Theoc.'s epigrams, see Cameron 1993, 141–4, L. Argentieri, *ZPE* 121 (1998), 7, K. Gutzwiller, *Philologus* 140 (1996), 92–9 (the first collection of Theoc.'s epigrams was published between 100 and 40 BC).

[17] First Bergk entitling the collection Παίγνια ἢ Ἐπιγράμματα, cf. also Barber ²*OCD*, 814 (after the 1st ed. (1949), 678), Webster 41, Trypanis 267, F. Williams, ³*OCD*, 1164.

[18] The inventor of the genre is naturally 'Homer' with *Margites* and *Batrachomyomachia.* On the genre see A. von Blumenthal, *RE* XVIII.2.2396–98, Lausberg 358f., M. Puelma, *MH* 53 (1996), 127, D. Bain, *CQ* n.s. 48 (1998), 264 ("a catch-all title"). On the technopaegnia see Fränkel 56f., Hutchinson 17, Weber 119, Cameron 1995, 33–7 (dating them to the late Hellenistic age). For P. as originator of *technopaegnia* see Christ-Schmid-Stählin 125 followed by Kuchenmüller 21 and Hunter 1996, 19; *contra*: Pfeiffer 1968, 90. Nowacki 20, 53–4, following W. E. Weber, *Die eleg. Dichter der Hellenen*, Frankfurt 1826, 661 and L. Sbardella, *DNP* IX.820 were inclined to accept an amatory content. E. Martini in *Epitymbion . . H. Schwoboda*, Reichensberg 1927, 190–2 thought that P. wrote subjective erotic elegies in his *Paegnia.*

Fragmenta incertae sedis

Fr. 26

Arganthon is a mountain in Mysia identified with Yelli-Dagh, 957 m. high (É. Delage, *La géographie dans les* Argonautiques *d'Apollonios de Rhodes*, Bordeaux 1930, 115–6). Our information about its poetic occurrences relies almost entirely on the entry in EtG, which ultimately draws on a lost Σ (Theon > Sophocleius) on A.R. 1.1178 (now only Ἀργανθώνειον· ὄρος τῆς Κίου), an author with whom the EtG and EtM are well acquainted (Vian i, xliif). From that Σ, through Orus' *Ethnica*, depends also Steph. Byz. 111.17 Ἀργανθών, see Wendel 1932, 94–5. It is dug up and introduced into poetry by P. and it soon became *the* mountain of Mysia. It appears in an Argonautic context (Hylas episode) in A.R., Nic. *Heter.* fr. 48 (Ant. Lib. 26.2), Strabo 12.4.3 (reporting of an ὀρειβασία θιασευόντων καὶ καλούντων Ὕλαν on Arganthon, for which cf. also A.R. 1.1354, Ant. Lib. 26.5, Virg. *E.* 6.44), Orph. *Arg.* 637–8, Prop. 1.20.33, and perhaps in Euph. *CA* 75 (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 12, see De Cuenca on his fr. 71) and Simylus *SH* 725, both from EtG *l.c.*[1] Cessi 1914, 286 n. 1, who considered the quotation in EtG as Philitan, thought of Telephus wandering in Mysia to find his mother. More relevant to P. may be a story about the huntress Arganthone (καλόν τι χρῆμα νύμφης according to Arrian *FGrH* 156 F 83), Rhesus' wife, whose tragic death in the area when she heard of her husband's fate gave the mountain its name. Her story is mostly known from Parth. *Erot. path.* 36 trading under the name of Asclepiades of Myrlea *Bithyniaca FGrH* 697 F 2, who showed in this work an interest in the traditions of his motherland. Steph. Byz. 111.17 Ἀργανθών· ὄρος Μυσίας ἐπὶ τῇ Κίῳ, ἀπὸ Ἀργανθώνης Ῥήσου γυναικός. λέγεται καὶ Ἀργανθώνη καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὸ ὄρος. τὸ κτητικὸν Ἀργανθώνειος indicates that this information may once have stood in Theon's Σ on A.R. 1.1178 which might rehearse a treatment by P., cf. then in poetry the elegant Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 939.19–21 (perhaps of Imperial date).

Bach 58 had printed the citation in EtG as a fragment of P. A long established *opinio communis* gives the line to Euph. and it seems

[1] For an Argonautic context see G. Türk, *De Hyla*, Breslau 1895, 39f., R. Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 35 (1900), 94 n. 2. It is not clear who first linked the Hylas episode with Arganthon. The mountain very probably did not appear in the first attestation of the myth in Hellanic. *FGrH* 4 F 131b = Σ A.R. 1.1207 (109.17 Wendel).

correct. Euph.'s fragment may come from the same context as *CA* 74 Μυσοῖο παρ' ὕδασιν Ἀσκανίοιο (of Hylas' rapture?). Kuchenmüller 86 may also be right in suggesting that Euph. might have taken up the expression Ἀργανθώνιον αἶπος from P., which would account for the omission of the Philitan quotation in favour of the better-known poet. If this is so, Theoc. 7.148 Παρνάσιον αἶπος is relevant here. αἶπος occurs first in tragedy (see Fraenkel on Aesch. *Ag.* 285 Ἀθῷον αἶπος, who suspects occurrences in post-Homeric epic) and in similar formations found a place as clausula in Hellenistic poetry, cf. A.R. 2.505 Μυρτώσιον αἶπος/, Euph. *l.c.*, see Ll-J — Parsons on Parth. *SH* 652 Τυφρήστιον αἶπος (for "Adesp. 1075" read "Adesp. 1175"). On the variation of the ending see *idd.* on Parth. *SH* 657 Ἐπιδάμνειος.

Fr. 27

Σ Theoc. 2.120b quote this fragment to illustrate the function of the erotic apples. In Theoc. Philinus approaches the house of his beloved Simaetha μᾶλα μὲν ἐν κόλποισι Διωνύσοιο φυλάσσων,/κρατὶ δ' ἔχων λεύκαν, Ἡρακλέος ἱερὸν ἔρνος (120–1). The story of Hippomenes and Atalante appears in Theoc. 3.40–2, where an enamoured goatherd offers Amaryllis ten apples (3.10) and then adduces an appropriate parallel: Ἱππομένης, ὅκα δὴ τὰν παρθένον ἤθελε γᾶμαι,/μᾶλ' ἐν χερσὶν ἑλὼν δρόμον ἄνυεν· ἁ δ' Ἀταλάντα/ὡς ἴδεν ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὺν ἅλατ' ἔρωτα. As Wil. *Kl. Schr.* v.2, 96–7 saw, this passage is directly indebted to P. In Hes. *Cat.* frr. 72–6 Hippomenes beats Atalante in a footrace by throwing at her three golden apples provided him by Aphrodite, which the maiden pauses to pick up.[2] But these apples of P. are not the usual tokens of love; nor in this version is Atalante beaten in the footrace because of her delays. They rather possess the power to provoke uncontrollable erotic desire in their recipient, as the magic apples of *Suppl. Mag.* 72.i.10f. (Augustan period) ἣ <δ'> ἂν δῶ μήλῳ τε βάλω μήλῳ τε πατάξω/πάντα ὑπερθέμενη μαίνοιτ' ἐπ' ἐμῇ φιλότητι/.../... <καὶ> μὴ παύσαιτο φιλῶν με./<πότνια> Κυπρογένεια τέλει τελέαν ἐπαοιδήν, cf. also Long. 2.4.4 (Philetas of Eros)

---

[2] See Gow on Theoc. 3.40. On the apples in the Atalante myth see J. Trumpf, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 20–1, M. Lagauer, *Untersuchungen zur Symbolik des Apfels in der Antike*, Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg 1967, 90–6, M. K. Brazda, *Zur Bedeutung des Apfels in der antiken Kultur*, Diss. Bonn 1977, 69f. On the relation of the Philitan and Theocritean passages see Schweizer 51, U. Ott, *Die Kunst des Gegensatzes in Theokrits Hirtengedichte*, Hildesheim 1969, 182, M. Fantuzzi, *PCPS* 41 (1995), 22–3.

στὰς δὲ πλησίον . . . ἔβαλλέ με τοῖς μύρτοις καὶ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἔθελγε μηκέτι θυμοῦσθαι. That Aphrodite's gifts can have such a power is already known from her κεστός used by Hera to lure Zeus in *Il.* 14.214f., see C. A. Faraone, "Aphrodite's κεστός and the apples for Atalante", *Phoenix* 14 (1990), 230–38.

The provenance of the apples which Aphrodite handed over to Hippomenes varies. They are said to come from the garden of the Hesperids in Σ Theoc. 3.40–2b (127.11 Wendel), *ibid.* c (128.2 Wendel) > Virg. *E.* 6.61, Mythogr. Vat. 139 or from Aphrodite's grove in Tamassos (Cyprus) in Ov. *Met.* 10.644f., see Bömer ad loc. An Attic red-figure calyx crater of *c.* 420 BC depicts Atalanta and Hippomenes nude before the footrace while Aphrodite receives the apples from a winged Eros, see J. M. Barringer, *ClA* 15 (1996), 71–4. Here they come from Dionysus' wreath. A wreath of apples would not be unparalleled (Hippon. *IEG* 60, Meleag. *HE* 1.27), but Dionysus' involvement is exceptional.

Σ Theoc. 2.120a (289.20 Wendel) say that Call. fr. 412 ἐν τῷ Περὶ λογάδων (?collection of diverse rare stories?) τὸν Διονύσου στέφανον ἐκ μήλων εἶναί φησιν, ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὸν Ἱππομένην λαβεῖν Ἀφροδίτης αἰτησαμένης, ὡς Διόδωρος ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν Κορινθιακοῖς (*FGrH* 452). Aphrodite and Dionysus work together for erotic purposes in Anacr. *PMG* 346.56?, 357 ~ *Anacreont.* 43.12f., 49, 52.5f., *al.*, Solon *IEG* 26, Plato *Symp.* 177e, perhaps in PMich. 4926i.7–8 (saec. p.C. III *in.*; *apud* W. Luppe, *ZPE* 93 (1992), 157f.), and they are conjoined in Machon 80 as subjects of Philoxenus' poetry. P. may rely for this version, which then occurs in Call., on a peripheral source, since the poet Diodorus, whom Schneider 1873, 284 identified with the Elaite (therefore *SH* 381) known from Parth. *Erot. path.* 15 = *SH* 380 (παρὰ Διοδώρῳ τῷ Ἐλαΐτῃ ἐν Ἐλεγείαις), may in fact be a much earlier poet from the region of Corinth, see Jacoby on Diodorus *FGrH* 452. Jacoby's identification gathers support from the fact that Call. seems to draw on Diodorus, as well as from the consideration that this version, enhancing the role of Dionysus, may originate in the region of Corinth. P. would know it from a local source, as may be the case with the vocable ἰάκχα (*At. Gl.* fr. 40) of a Sicyonian στεφάνωμα εὐῶδες, a term probably related to Dionysus/Iacchus who was broadly worshipped in that wine-producing area. This Corinthian/Sicyonian tale would serve to counterbalance the Boeotian and Arcadian versions of the Atalante story. Wendel 1920, 99 asserted that from Call. fr. 412 an early mythographical Σ arose, which was

then permeated to different authors treating the Atalante-myth and would be the source of the Theocritean Σ, to which Theon introduced P. Σ Theoc. 3.40–2d (128.4 Wendel) distinguishing between a Boeotian and an Arcadian Atalanate may go back to him (fr. *61). Hippomenes' apples come close to Dionysus also in Nonn. *D.* 48.180–2 where the god wins Pallene as his bride after a wrestling fight and his gain is compared with that of Hippomenes casting to Atalante χρυσοφαῆ προπάροιθε γαμήλια δῶρα. Significantly, Aphrodite's granting of the apples, unlike *D.* 12.88–9, is suppressed here.

The wording of the Theocritean Σ might harbour some Philitan vestiges. ταῦτα δὲ εἰς ἔρωτα τὴν Ἀταλάντην *ἐκίνησεν* wittily hints at the foot-race and is more than what is expected from a Scholiast. Theoc.'s 3.42 spirited ὡς ἐς βαθὺν *ἅλατ'* ἔρωτα might have found a precedent in P.

The relative clause prompts the impression that the reference to the myth of Atalante is a passing one. The word seems to have been of (magic/erotic?) apples: τά οἵ ποτε etc. If P. treated Polyphemus (cf. Theoc. 7.151f.), these kind of apples could be mentioned in a context similar to Theoc. 2.120. The transmission and the erotic traits of this fragment favour this possibility. Others, as Rohde 1914, 79, saw the desired evidence for an erotic elegy. Earlier efforts to argue for a Philitan influence on Prop. 1.1.15f., who follows the Boeotian version involving a footrace and golden apples, were abandoned, but F. Cairns in *Hommages à J. Veremas*, Brussels 1986, 37–8 suggested that Prop. contaminated his sources and gave P. a secondary role.

From a technical point of view, the intricate word-order of this fragment with the relative pronoun preceding its antecedent is noteworthy. It constitutes an affinity with Call., who is accused by Apoll. Dysc. of being one of οἱ τὰς <συντάξεις> παρασυγχέοντες (I.239.5 Schneider), see Hollis 1990, 14, *id.* on *Hec.* fr. 167 and cf. A.R. 3.333–9.

27.1. τά οἵ ποτε Κύπρις ἑλοῦσα/μῆλα Cf. Nic. fr. 50.1–2 ἢ Σιδόεντος ἠὲ Πλείστου ἀπὸ κήπων/μῆλα ταμὼν χνοάοντα, Colluth. 60–1 ἔνθεν Ἔρις . . . ἑλοῦσα/μῆλον. ἑλοῖσα of most MSS is a Doricism due to Theoc. So is Διωνύσοιο in *K.*

27.2a. μῆλα Διωνύσου . . ἀπὸ κροτάφων is an ambiguous wording. Dionysus was οὐ μόνον τοῦ οἴνου . ., ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ὑγρᾶς φύσεως . . . κύριον καὶ ἀρχηγόν (Plut. *Is. et Os.* 365a *cl.* Pind. fr. 153), see E. R.

Dodds, *Euripides, Bacchae*, Oxford ²1960, xi–xii, Blech 181–5. As such, he is the patron of all fruits and apples were said to have been invented by him, cf. Athen. 3.82d ὅτι δὲ καὶ τῶν μήλων εὑρετής ἐστι Διόνυσος μαρτυρεῖ Θεόκριτος ὁ Συρακόσιος οὑτωσί πως λέγων· [2.120–1]. Νεοπτόλεμος δ' ὁ Παριανὸς ἐν τῇ Διονυσιάδι (*CA* 1) καὶ αὐτὸς ἱστορεῖ ὡς ὑπὸ Διονύσου εὑρεθέντων τῶν μήλων, καθάπερ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀκροδρύων (see H. J. Mette, *RhM* n.s. 123 (1980), 15), Diod. Sic. 3.63.2 (Dionysus taught humanity the gathering of fruits) and see Blech 183 n. 13.

27.2b. ἀπὸ κροτάφων/ effects a common Hellenistic pentameter clausula-form, cf. fr. 12.2 ἀπὸ πραπίδων/, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 100.4 ἀπὸ κροτάφων/, Simias *HE* 1.2 = Call. *HyPal.* 12 = Alc. Mess. *HE* 14.6 = Rhian. *HE* 7.4 ἀπὸ στομάτων/, Posid. *HE* 8.4 ἀπὸ προθύρων/, 11.6 ἀπὸ σταδίων/, Antip. Sid. *HE* 15.8 ἀπὸ στολίδων/, 45.4 ἀπὸ πλοκάμων/, *GVI* 1039.4 (2nd cent. BC) ἀπὸ βλεφάρων/, 1627.10 (1st cent. BC) ἀπὸ σταγόνων/, *SEG* 30.483.4 (Thespiai, undated) ἀπὸ προσόδων/, further Call. *HE* 13.4 ἀπὸ στεφάνων | (pent. diaeresis), then Nicarch. *HE* 4.4 ἀπ' ἀσταχύων/, Theodor. *HE* 17.4 ἀπ' Ἰλλυριῶν/, *GES* 56.4 (*c.* 300 BC) ἀπ' ἠϊθέων/, *GVI* 1150.14 ἀπ' ἀθανάτων. There are only rare occurrences in pre-Hellenistic (Mimn. *IEG* 12.8 ἀφ' Ἑσπερίδων/) or Imperial pentameters.

27.2c. κροτάφων κρόταφοι, 11x in Homer, is a term of medical colouring which, although it does not occur in Call., has a regular distribution in Hellenistic poetry: Asclep. *HE* 46.1, Theoc. 7x (11.9, 14.68, 15.85, [20].23, 22.124, 125, 30.13 — the entry in Rumpel's *Lexicon* is misleading), A.R. 2x (1.219, 1261), Arat. 2x (56, 69), Euph. *CA* 84.5 and perhaps *SH* 428.8, Phanias *HE* 2.2, Nic. 2x (*Ther.* 732, *Alex.* 27), Antip. Sid. *HE* 51.2 (the only occurrence in singular), Meleag. *HE* 46.5, Anon. *FGE* 97.7, *Batrachom.* 131, most likely Epica Adesp. *CA* 9.iii.9 and in contemporary inscriptions, *GVI* 653.6 (2nd/3rd cent. BC), 1916.8 (Rhodes, 2nd cent. BC), 1991.9 (1st cent. BC), *GVICyr* 5.18 (2nd cent. BC), *GES* 73B.4 (m. 2nd cent. BC), cf. also Homeric πολιοκρόταφον in Antip. Sid. *HE* 28.4, *GVI* 1821.3 (2nd cent. BC) and the absolute hapax δολιχοκροτάφου in *CEG* 779.3 (Attica, 4th cent. BC?).

Fr. 28

A true rarity. Ichnai is mentioned in Hdt. 7.123.3 as a town in Macedon, cf. also Hsch. ι 1154 Ἰχναίην χώραν· τὴν Μακεδονίαν and

see A-H-S on *HHAp.* 94. An aetium for its name is provided by Steph. Byz. 342.19 Ἴχναι· . . . [Themis] διωκομένη . . ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς κατελήφθη ἐν τοῖς τῶν Ἰχναίων τόποις, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ διωχθῆναι κατ' ἴχνος ὠνομάσθη (note that κατ' (. .) ἴχνος/-ιον/-ια is a rare poetic conjunction, Simias *Ov.* 15, A.R. 1.575 with Vian ad loc.). Eratosthenes called this Macedonian town Achnai. Steph. Byz. 152.16 s.v. Ἄχναι refers first to a Thessalian and then to a Boeotian town of that name and Strabo 9.5.14 calls the Thessalian town Ichnai and refers to the noted local cult of Themis Ichnaia, see J. Cl. Decourt, *La vallée de l'Énipeus en Thessalie*, Athens-Paris 1990, 154–5. Erat., author of Γεωγραφικά in three books, was probably aware of these traditions and called the Macedonian town (commonly called Ichnai) Achnai to distinguish it from the Thessalian Ichnai. Strabo *l.c.* would draw on his vein (via Apollod. of Athens?). Since P.'s Achnai is not related to the town in Macedon, it might have to do with the Thessalian one. The bonds linking Thessaly to Cos may lend colour to this possibility. The reference to P. might then survive in a polemical passage of Erat. supporting his inversion of the traditional names.

There is no indication as to the work of P. in which Erat. would find a reference to the Thessalian? Achnai. However, centaur Chiron, possibly treated by P. (cf. Theoc. 7.148f.), lived in Thessaly (ἴχνος is a word apposite of an animal's hoofs). Achnai for Ichnai may be a deliberate archaism, as that may be the original form of the place-name (Roscher v, 590), which might suggest treatment of a mythological event. Kuchenmüller 85 transposed the reference to the poetical fragments "quod non verisimile est Coum in grammaticis de eiusmodi rebus egisse"; it was first classified as such by Kayser 70 (his fr. xxvi).

Alleged Poetical Ascriptions

As Knox 68 put it "the name of Philetas will always be an attractive peg on which to hang a lost work". No doubt, the following list will soon be outdated with new alleged ascriptions. I believe no passage discussed here to be a good candidate for Philitan authorship.

1. [PLouvre inv. 7733 verso, saec. p.C. II, ed. F. Lassere, *QUCC* n.s. 19 (1975), 145 = Adesp. Pap. Epigr. *SH* 983 = Anon. *FGE* 153.]

ὄστρειον
[Μέ]μ̣ν̣ο̣ν̣ος Αἰ̣θ̣ιοπ̣ῆος ὄ̣π̣ο̣υ̣ χυ̣τὸν ἠρίον ἐστίν
.....]..... [.]τρ.φ[...].. [ ]τ..ο̣[ ].[ ].
[........]ης δ' ἀδ̣άμαν̣τ̣ο̣[ς ἐ]π̣ὶ σπιλάδεσσι τιθήνει,
'Αγροτέρης ἐραταῖς λαμπάσι τερπόμενον·
θ̣[οίν]η̣ δ̣' [εἰ]μὶ βροτοῖσιν ἀφέψαλος, ἡνίκ̣α Δωσοῦς
[νυμφί]ο̣ς [ἀ]νδιχάση̣ ῥινοτόροις βέλεσιν.

F. Lassere *l.l.* published this Louvre papyrus, which contains a riddle along with a commentary on it of at least 69 lines, and argued for Philitan authorship (esp. pp. 167–74) on the grounds of Homeric knowledge, absorption of science with regard to oysters (Hellespontine Abydos was famous for its oysters and the oysters grow fatter as the moon waxes), the oracular nature of the epigram linking it with P.'s *Paegnia* and a misreading of v. 2 where Lassere had read .ε̣]π̣τ̣οπ̣ο̣τ̣ο̣ν̣.[1] The versification is polished but, unlike what we know of P., all three hexameters have a female caesura, their 2nd foot is always unresolved, as is the whole first part of the pentameters. The learned and Hellenistic traits of this epigram are unmistakable; it may come from a book containing enigmatic epigrams and it may be considered as comparable to P. fr. 25.

2 For [Μέ]μ̣ν̣ο̣ν̣ος Αἰ̣θ̣ιοπ̣ῆος cf. Call. fr. 110.52 Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπος/ and see Clausen 1987, 105. χυτὸν ἠρίον emulates Homeric χυτὴ γαῖα by using the Homeric hapax (*Il.* 23.126) ἠρίον, much affected since early Hellenistic times.

4 σπιλάς is Homeric and Hellenistic, A.R. 7x, Call. *HyDel.* 243, Theoc. *HE* 20.6, Euph. *CA* 3, Nic. *Alex.* 289, Lyc. 1081, Amyntas

[1] Lassere convinced Calderon 27–8 and lured Lausberg 358 and F. Montanari in *id.* 86, 132, but his ascription remains only a "faint possibility" for Hollis 1996, 57 n. 6 and E. Livrea, *ZPE* 125 (1999), 67.

SH 42.2, Adesp. Pap. Epigr. *SH* 978.11, Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 923.14, trivialised in Opp. *Hal.* (13x).

5 Ἀγροτέρη of Artemis (here = *Luna*) in Homer only *Il.* 21.476, cf. Hsch. α 835 ἀγροτέραν· ὀρείαν. τὴν Ἄρτεμιν. See Maehler on Bacch. 11.37, C. Maudit, *REG* 107 (1994), 47–67, *LSJ Suppl.* s.v., Threatte ii, 305, E. Dettori, *RFIC* 127 (1999), 187f. (esp. frequent in Attica; in Cos *SEG* 45.1120).

6 For ἀφέψαλος cf. Hsch. α 8625 ἀφεψάλου· ἄνευ σπινθῆρος λαμπροῦ, which is possibly a poetic quotation (Hollis 1998, 67). Δωσώ 'Aphrodite' is a rarity plausibly restored as Demeter's pseudonym in *HHD* 122, cf. also Hsch. ε 6774 Εὐδωσώ· ἡ Ἀφροδίτη ἐν Συρακούσαις and Theodoridas cited in lines 47–53 of the commentary (*SH* 743 = *FGE*, 95).

7 ῥινοτόρος is a Homeric hapax of Ares in *Il.* 21.392 (~ Hes. *Theog.* 934). Δωσοῦς νυμφί]ος 'Ares' = 'knife' glances at an ancient interpretation of ὀξὺς Ἄρης as 'sword' in *Il.* 7.330, see G-P on Antip. Thess. *GPh* 23.2.

2. [P. *Inc. sed.* *CA* 17 = *Hermeneia* fr. 4 Diehl = *Hermes* fr. 3 Nowacki = *At. Gl.* fr. 53]

λευγαλέος δὲ χιτὼν πεπινωμένος, ἀμφὶ δ' ἀραιῇ
ἰξὺς εἱλεῖται κόμμα μελαγκράνινον

Glossa marg. apud Strabo 3.5.1, II.83 Lassere μελαγκρανίνας (-ανίς Meineke)· σχοίνου εἶδος, ἐξ οὗ πλέκεται τὰ σχοινία· καὶ Φιλήτας γε (Coraes: τε codd.) ἐν Ἑρμηνείᾳ· 'λευγαλέος — μελάγκραινον', ὡς σχοίνῳ ἐζωσμένου.

2 ἰλεῖται codd.: εἱλεῖται Salmasius | μελάγκραινον codd.: -άνιον Salmasius: corr. Coraes

As first Schneidewin 147 (cf. M. Schmidt, *RhM* 6 (1848), 409f.) asserted, this is a gloss discussed by P. in *Hermeneia* where he quoted an anonymous distich to illustrate his interpretation. It is considered as *incerti poetae* by Wil. 1924 i, 115 n. 1, Barber, ²*OCD*, 814, Pfeiffer 1968, 91, R. Tosi in Montanari 147, Rengakos 1994, 108 n. 480, but earlier it was commonly ascribed to P., cf. Brunck 234, Kayser 52–3, Jacobs 123, Bach 34–5, Meineke 348–50, Diehl and Powell.[2]

[2] Therefore, Meineke thought that the fragment describes "aut Achaemenidem aliquem vel Philoctetem". Cessi 1914, 287–8 associated it with Telephus, notoriously represented wearing rags in Eur.'s play, and attributed the fragment to *Telephus*.

This could only be true, if P. inserted portions of his poetry into his philological works. It is, however, unlikely that P. would have adduced passages of his own to enhance his own interpretations.

The couplet is of high quality, vividly descriptive and apparently of a date not long before P. ἐζωσμένου in Strabo shows that the character involved is a male. Charon's representation in Virg. *A.* 6.298–301 may belong to the same vein as this fragment:[3]

portitor . . horrendus . . .
terribili squalore Charon, cui plurima mento
canities inculta iacet, stant lumina flamma
sordidus ex umeris nodo dependet amictus.

Charon, working on the banks of Acheron, would be able to find schoenus easily (cf. *Il.* 4.383, *Od.* 5.463; see Lembach 37–8) and he is associated with dark colours (G-P on Anyte *HE* 7.3f.), but ἀραιή/ἰξύς may be an impediment to such an identification. One might think of a sordid, emaciated cynic philosopher, like the ones of whom the *Spottepigramm* had a lot to say.

1 Cf. of the cynic philosopher Diogenes, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 97.3 ῥυπόεντι πίνῳ πεπαλαγμένον ἔσθος (Leon. Tar. *HE* 59.5–6 παλαιόν/ ἔσθος), then Epica Inc. *CA* 5 φάρεϊ ῥωγαλέῳ <τε> πίνου καπνοῦ τ' ἀναμέστῳ, Soph. *OC* 1259. λευγαλέος is here extended to apply to material objects. The form πεπινωμένος is embedded amidst epic vocabulary. It comes up first here, then Plut. *Alex.* 4.3, and may be modelled on Homeric (εἵματ') ῥερυπωμένα (*Od.* 6.59), cf. Σ A.R. 2.301 πινόεν·ῥερυπωμένον, Hsch. α 6208 ἀπινεῖται· ἀπορυποῦται. Πίνος γὰρ ὁ ῥύπος, *id.* π 2317.

2 ἰξύς reflects its Homeric usage in *Od.* 5.231 = 10.544 περὶ δὲ ζώνην βάλετ' ἰξυῖ (Calypso and Circe respectively), cf. Long. 1.4.2 (statues of Nymphs) ζῶμα περὶ τὴν ἰξύν, Dion. Per. 840. — On ἀμφὶ . . ./. . εἰλεῖται cf. Call. *Aet.* *SH* 253b.1a–1 ἀμφί τε κῆρες⌋/⌊εἰλε⌋ῦ̣ν-⌊τ⌋αι, further [Mosch.] *Megara* 104 περὶ δ' αὐτὸν . . εἰλεῖτο φλόξ/. μελαγκράνινος takes into consideration μελαγκρανίς 'black bog-rush

The MSS' Ἑρμηνείᾳ would be corrupt. He convinced Calderon 24. Webster 41 thought of a fisherman as those in [Theoc.] 21 and in Hellenistic art. Bowie 75 (and A. S. Hollis) saw in it a point of limited resemblance with Lycidas in Theoc. 7.15f., whereas Asper 163 n. 140 approached Theoc. 14.3f.

[3] On Charon's garments in art see Sourvinou-Inwood 303f., 347f. He enjoys some popularity in Hellenistic poetry, cf. Theoc. 16.41, 17.49, Hermesian. *CA* 7.4, Leon. Tar. *HE* 59.1–2. The two passages were first associated by Nowacki 28–9.

(*schoenus nigricans*)' in Theophr. *HP* 4.12.1 (possibly a *terminus post quem*), see *At. Gl.* fr. 53.

3. [Phylarch. *SH* 694A = Phylarch.? *FGrH* 81 F 84 = P. Dub. *CA* 25 = 28 Kuch.]

Νισύριοι μοῦνοι μὲν ἐλεύθεροι ἱεροεργοί,
ἄνδρασι †προσκεινοισιν ἐλεύ<θε>ρον ἆμαρ ἔχοντες·
δούλων δ' οὔτις πάμπαν ἐσέρχεται οὐδ' ἠβαιόν

Athen. 14.639d, III.441 Kaibel Κῷοι δὲ τοὐναντίον δρῶσιν, ὥς ἱστορεῖ Μακαρεὺς ἐν τρίτῳ Κῳακῶν (*FGrH* 456 F 1b)· ὅταν γὰρ τῇ Ἥρᾳ θύωσιν, δοῦλοι οὐ παραγίνονται ἐπὶ τὴν εὐωχίαν. διὸ καὶ Φύλαρχον (A: Εὐφορίωνα Meineke: Φιλητᾶν tempt. Kaibel) εἰρηκέναι· 'σουριηι — ἠβαιόν'. Cf. Athen. 6.262c, II.83 Kaibel sine loco poetico.

1 σουριηι A: "Iunonis sive nomen, sive cognomen" Kaibel, inde Οὐρανίῃ Herzog, *Philol.* 65 (1906), 633: corr. Dalechamps **2** προσκεινοισιν A: πρὸς (πὰρ Meineke) Κῴοισιν Villebrun: "latet aliud" Kaibel | ἔλευρον A: corr. Musurus

This corrupt citation comes from a poet who was probably held in esteem by Coan literati, as it was quoted in the 3rd book of Macareus' Κῳακά. Macareus is dated to the 3rd cent. BC on the strength of his name, which is common in 3rd cent. (less so in 2nd cent.) Cos and rare in other times or places (*LGPN* i, 296). Phylarchus might as well be a near-contemporary Coan poet, see Ll-J i, 26. Some were tempted to ascribe these lines to P.[4]

Wil. 1931/32 i, 283 n. 3 related this fragment to the cult of Hera *Argeia*, which would originally be confined to the Greek settlers of Cos. The Coans considered the Argolid as their ancestral home and in Argos participation in Hera's cult was forbidden to foreigners (Hdt. 6.81, see R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid*, London 1972, 203–4), whence the Coans would inherit the exclusion of foreigners from Hera's cult. This prohibition later took the form of an eventful aetium. Plut. *Quaest. gr.* 304c–d (< Macareus?) tells of the refuge offered to Heracles, Hera's old foe, when he was cornered in a battle with the Coans, by a Thracian woman (i.e. slave?), see Jacoby on Macareus *l.c.*, Craik 165. The provincial poet Phylarchus is not known from any other source.

[4] Kaibel, Bergk, Powell, Kuchenmüller and Sbardella 107–13, the latter as part of an alleged *ktisis*-poem on Cos by P.

1 Dalechamps' emendedation seems attractive: "nimirum Νι- per lipographiam post εἰρηκέναι excidit" (Powell). Nisyros bore ancient ties with Cos and there was a definitive Coan claim for a special relation with it (Sh-W 32–3, Hallof — Habicht 132–3). Νισύριοι would mean that among foreigners only the Nisyrians, enjoying special privileges in Cos (1 μοῦνοι), were legitimised to participate in the ritual of Hera. — ἱεροεργός designates the person in charge of a religious ceremony. Call. fr. 517 in an utterance of Apollo, shows its noble effect. The term may be an attempt to provide a grander alternative to the trivial ἱεροποιός.[5]

2 ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ (ἀπούρας/) is a technical term in Homer (3x, see Kirk on *Il.* 6.455; ἦμαρ 'state'), which is shunned by the erudite poets. It may have an actual legal strength here too. ἔχοντες is feeble. Meineke proposed ἄγουσι (Kuchenmüller 87 ἄγοντες).

3 Cf. *Il.* 13.701–2 Αἴας δ' οὐκέτι πάμπαν, . . . /ἵστατ' . . . οὐδ' ἠβαιόν/, then *Od.* 9.462 ἐλθόντες δ' ἠβαιόν.

4a. [Philitas Samius *AP* 6.210 = *HE* 1]

Πεντηκονταέτις καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἡ φιλέραστος
  Νικιὰς εἰς νηὸν Κύπριδος ἐκρέμασεν
σάνδαλα καὶ χαίτης ἀνελίγματα τόν τε διαυγῆ
4 χαλκὸν ἀκριβείης οὐκ ἀπολειπόμενον
καὶ ζώνην πολύτιμον ἅ τ' οὐ φωνητὰ πρὸς ἀνδρός,
  ἀλλ' ἐσορᾷς πάσης Κύπριδος ὀπτασίην.

Ἀνάθημα τῇ αὐτῇ [sc. Ἀφροδίτῃ] παρὰ Νικιάδος· Φιλιτᾶ [C] Σαμίου (caret Pl.)
1 πεντηκονταέτης P: corr. Reiske **3** τόν τε apogr. B: τὸν δὲ P **5** φωνητὰ C: -νῆι τὰ P **6** ἐς ὁρηῖ P: corr. Jacobs.

4b. [Philitas Samius *AP* 7.481 = *HE* 2]

Ἁ στάλα βαρύθουσα λέγει τάδε· 'τὰν μινύωρον
  τὰν μικκὰν Ἀίδας ἅρπασε Θειοδόταν·'
χὰ μικκὰ τάδε πατρὶ λέγει· 'πάλιν ἴσχεο λύπας,
  Θειόδοτε· θνατοὶ πολλάκι δυστυχέες.'

[5] ἱεροποιός is the term occurring in the sacred documents, see the *Index* in *LSCG*, 343, and in Cos, cf. *HG* 1.38, 39, 51 (4th cent. BC), *IdC* ED 71f.B.15 (4th cent. BC), *HG* 8.33 (3rd cent. BC), *IdC* ED 93.5 (3rd cent. BC), 89.7 (1st cent. BC). ἱερουργός is rare, see *LSJ* s.v. with *Suppl.* (add *LSCG* 144A.5, B.4 (Lebena, 2nd cent. BC)), Sokolowski on *LSCG* 3.8 (ἱερουργέω), F. Bader, *Les composés grecs du type de Demiourgos*, Paris 1965, 136–8.

[C] Φιλιτᾶ Σαμίου [J] εἰς μικρήν τινα θυγατέρα Θεοδότου [C] καὶ αὐτὴν Θεοδότην καλουμένην (caret Pl.) **1** μινύωρον C: -ριον P **3** χὰ μικκὰ apogr.: χ' ἀμμικὰ P **4** πολλὰ P: corr. Reiske.

The corrector added the ethnic in the first epigram and both name and ethnic in the second. The epigrams belong in a Meleagrean context but neither is a Philitas mentioned in his preface nor does Meleager seem to have added ethnics to the names of poets. This became necessary because of later accretions but again there is only one Philitas in *AP*, see *HE* ii, 476. Since 4a.3–4 τόν τε διαυγῆ/χαλκόν recurs in Call. *HyPal.* 21, Bulloch 130 n. 4 was inclined to attribute these epigrams to the Coan, but he appeared more sceptical in Easterling-Knox 546. They were first printed as Philitan by Jacobs 121. Would Meleager fail to mention P. in his preface? The Coan is never linked with Samos and the corrector might have added the ethnic to distinguish the lesser known poet from his famous namesake in a broader context. Note that the name Νικιάς in 2 of the first epigram stands on a solid Samian tradition: a Samian hetaira Νικώ is attested in Athen. 5.220f and the name occurs in context 3x in Asclepiades (G-P on Asclep. *HE* 10.2). No other source provides any information about the Samian Philitas.

5. [Athen. T. 21 = Anon. *FGE* 134]

ξεῖνε, Φιλίτας εἰμί. λόγων ὁ ψευδόμενός με
ὤλεσε καὶ ν υ κ τ ῶ ν φ ρ ο ν τ ί δ ε ς ἑ σ π έ ρ ι ο ι.

Page (*FGE*, 443) deemed that "the main point of the epigram may be that this is parody of the style of Philitas, if not an actual example of a καλούμενος τῶν λόγων ψευδολόγος taken from his writings". The epigram was written by a contemporary of P. familiar with his treatment in comedy. The juxtaposition of νυκτῶν and ἑσπέριοι may well be an on the spot specimen of a ψευδόμενος λόγος, but its credentials may be in comedy, as comedy made use of Eubulides' logical riddle of ψευδόμενος λόγος (Adesp. *PCG* 149; Eubulides himself may have appeared on stage, see *PCG* v, 186) and such games may have been employed in relation to literati or indeed to P.

6. [*At. Gl.* fr. 50]

παύσω σε τῆς σκύζης

Hsch. σ 1148, IV.51 Schmidt σκύζης· παρὰ Φιλίτᾳ· 'παύσω σε τῆς σκύζης', ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς κάπρας.

From this quotation in Hesychius and from *id.* υ 262 ὑπ' αὐνήν† · παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ. Φιλίτας (*At. Gl.* fr. 51), Kayser 68 and Bach 67 concluded that P. wrote iambics. "Ineptit Bacchius p. 67" noted Meineke, *Fr. Com. Gr.* iv, Berlin 1861, 648 (Com. Anon. fr. 177), cf. Wil. 1924 ii, 116. M. Schmidt ad loc. regarded the iambic sequence as an anonymous quotation in P.'s *Ataktoi*. The fragment seems to be derived from comedy to which P. was so attentive in his scholarly works, cf. Ar. *Eq.* 429 ἐγώ σε παύσω τοῦ θράσους, *Lys.* 446 παύσω τιν' ὑμῶν τῆσδ' ἐγὼ τῆς ἐξόδου. Greek comedy likes zoological metaphors with sexual connotations and takes up σκυζᾶν as an abusive term for lustful women, cf. Phot. *Lex.* α 1663 (b, z) ἀνασκυζᾶν (Adesp. *PCG* *485)· ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐξοιστρεῖν καὶ ἀκολασταίνειν. καὶ ἐκσκυζᾶν Κρατῖνος (*PCG* 447), Φρύνιχος δὲ (*PCG* 86) σκυζᾶν ἔφη, see Chantraine *DE* s.v. σκύζα, Ch. de Lamberterie, *REG* 107 (1994), 21f.

The iambic fragments in Stobaeus ascribed to 'Philetas'/'Philitas' are alien to P. of Cos: Stob. 4.33.19 (V.804 Hense) = Philemon fr. 92 Kock (Φιλήτου SMA) = *Comp. Men. et Philist.* 2.59–67, Stob. 4.22.48 (IV.518 Hense) = Philemon fr. 239 Kock (Φιλη$^{\tau}$ S: Φιλίτα MA: Philemoni attr. Meineke: "sed nihil mutandum. immo intercidit Philetae dictum una cum nomine Φιλήμονος aliusve poetae comici" Hense ad loc.) = Men. *Sent.* 118, Stob. 2.1.5a, b, c (II.4 Wachsmuth) = *Comp. Men. et Philist.* 2.77–80 = Philemon fr. 118 Kock (Φιλήτα FP: Μιλητ L), Stob. 2.4.3 (II.27 Wachsmuth) = Philemon fr. 112 Kock (Φιλήμονος T: Φιλητ S: (Φ)ιλήτα A) = *Comp. Men. et Philist.* 2.189–91 and Stob. 2.46.11 (II.261 Wachsmuth, Φιλη$^{\tau}$ L: Φιλήμονος Meineke: Φιλήτου Gaisford) = *Comp. Men. et Philist.* 2.12–5 (attributing it to Men. under the title Μένανδρος. Περὶ Τύχης). These were printed by Kayser 71–3 among P.'s *Fragmenta Incerta et Suspecta* and *dubitanter* by Bach 61–7. They are not printed among Philemon's genuine fragments in *PCG*, see vol. vii, 317.

7. [POxy. 3723, pap. saec. p.C. II, edd. J. M. Bremmer – P. J. Parsons (1987)]

]ς σβέσσε δ' ἐὸν πῦρ
]. . [ ] α̣φροτόκοις
].ν̣. . .ον ἀμφιπυκάσσας
]. . . .ν τρίποδα
]. . .ονην ὑπὸ σηκῶν
].μενος στόματι
]. .ριο̣ν οὔτιναχρηνμο̣.

]. α. ου πάθεος
] παραὶ ποσὶ θῆχ' Ὑακίνθου
]ῳν ἱκετηριάδος
] Τμώλοιό τε πέζαν
ἠδὲ Κιθαιρῶνος δρυμοχόρου[
μύστισι σὺν βάκχαις, ὧν ἴα[χ
ἠχῆς εὐπατάγου πρὸς πόδα[
Ἰνδῷ σκῦλον ἔρωτος ἔθηκ' α.[
παιδὶ συνορχηστὴν θύρσον ε[
ναὶ μὴν Ἀλκμήνης κρατερὸς [
ἠδὲ λεοντείην ὅς ποτ' ἔναιρε β[ίην
ἠυκόμου Θρήϊκος Ὕλα κατετήκ[ετ
ἆθλον ἔρωτα λαβὼν πρὸς δεκ[α
πάντα †δαθεὶς χῶρον μάλ' ελε[
ῥύσασθαι χαλεπῶν θυμὸν ε[
ψυχή, πρὸς τίνα μῦθον ἔχω κα.[

2 κύμα]σιν ἀφροτόκοις edd. **4** ζ]άθεον edd. (M. A. Harder) **6** φθεγγ]όμενος edd. **8** κακοῦ edd. **11** πέζαν edd.: πέτραν Luppe, *CR* 39 (1989), 124 **12** -χόρου[ς σκοπιάς vel -χόρου [σκοπιάς edd. **13** ὧν ἴα[χε κύμβαλα καινὰ e.g. edd. (Ruijgh) **14** [ς ὀρνυμένης/ edd. (Ruijgh) **16** ἐ[πισχόμενος edd.: ἐ[ρυθροχρόῳ Luppe **17** [γόνος vel [πάις edd. **18** ως Pap.: ὅς Führer, *ZPE* 112 (1996), 67 | fin. suppl. edd. **19** κατετήκ[ετο κάλλει e.g. edd. **20** δέκ[α τοῦτο τρίτον edd., recepit Führer, *ZPE* 122 (1998), 47 n. 6 cl. Call. *HyAp*. 72 **21** δαθεις Pap.: καθεὶς Bernsdorff, *ZPE* 111 (1996), 43 | ἐλ{ε}[ίσσετο? edd. **22** ἐρωμανιῶν Führer, *ZPE* 74 (1988), 67 n. 2

P. J. Parsons, *MH* 45 (1988), 73f. (not in the *editio princeps*) and then M. Puelma, *Labor et Lima*, 413 suggested a poem by P. as the postulated model of this elegy. This lacunose elegy survives in a 2nd cent. AD papyrus from Oxyrynchus written in miniscule script. R. Führer, *ZPE* 122 (1998), 47–8 proposed P. as its possible author. This is unlikely for a poem which in 17f. apparently takes into account Theoc. 13.5f. ("incertissima . . attribuzione" for E. Livrea, *ZPE* 125 (1999), 67 too). The date and merits of this fragment are controversial, while literature on it is growing enormous.[6] It seems to be an early Imperial

[6] The best discussion is in POxy. LIV (1987), 58f. ("an amateur poet" of the Roman period, p. 59). See also P. J. Parsons, *MH* 45 (1988), 65f. ("spricht alles für Kaizerzeit", p. 72), F. Williams, *ZPE* 75 (1988), 57f., W. Luppe, *CR* n.s. 39 (1989), 124f. ("hellenistische Zeit . . . wahrscheinlicher", p. 124), *id.*, *APF* 42 (1996), 161f. ("ein späthellenistisches Werk" showing "eine gewisse Könnerschaft", p. 161), M. Hose, *Philologus* 138 (1994), 67f. (imperial date; follows a Latin model), A. M.

elegy (1st cent. AD?) by a poor poet. Führer compared this elegy with Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 962 which survives in a 2nd cent. AD papyrus from Oxyrynchus written in miniscule script (POxy. 2884), and hinted at the possibility of both papyri being derived from the same amateur hand. By comparing the rare rhythm of P. fr. 4.3 with *SH* 962.9 he would attribute *SH* 962 to P. too.

8. [PBerol. 13873, pap. saec. a.C. I/p.C. I, ed. W. Schubart, *Griech. Lit. Pap.*, Berlin 1950, 17 = Euph.? *SH* 429.46–9]

46 ἠνυσα ̣[
Αἰγαιηϲ̣[
48 τῆς οὐδ̣' [αἴθυιαι οὐδὲ κρυεροὶ καύηκες]
δύπτα̣ι ̣[

46 "ad fin. fort. τ̣[ς *SH* **48** Euph. *CA* 130 ins. Barigazzi

Scheibner 103f. published the fifty-four-line-long, badly mutilated hexameter fragment printed as Euph. *SH* 429? and attributed it to P. inserting *Hermes* fr. 4 in 46, cf. *id. Philologus* 111 (1967), 129–32. The editors of *SH* noted "et alii aliorum versus ab ἤνυσα incipiant", cf. also Fraser ii, 792 n. 21 *ad fin.* ("lacks any positive foundation"), Trypanis 267. A. Barigazzi convincingly fitted Euph. *CA* 130 in 48, see R. J. D. Carden, *BICS* 16 (1969), 34–5. Bowie 74–5 with n. 40 admitted that "mythological material seems to predominate and we are very far from bucolic" but insisted that "Philetas could still be the author" because 6–7 'Ωρομέδον[το]ς/]ε̣ζη̣ν ταυρώπιδος Ἥρη[ς "would be easier to explain". This carries little weight, as Oromedon is most probably not the Coan mountain but the giant Eurymedon, an aspiring lover of Hera (cf. Euph. *CA* 99), mentioned with features of her beauty in the next verse.

9. [P. Aliena *CA* 27 = *At. Gl.* fr. 40]

ἕστηκ' ἀμφὶ κόμας εὐώδεας ἀγχόθι πατρός
καλὸν ἰακχαῖον θηκαμένη στέφανον

Morelli, *RFIC* 122 (1994), 385f. (this and *SH* 964 are works "di modesti poeti di età imperiale"), J. L. Butrica, *PLILS* 9 (1996), 298–301 (Hellenistic), H. Bernsdorff, *ZPE* 111 (1996), 43–4 (καθείς in 21 for †δαθείς), R. Führer, *ZPE* 74 (1988), 22, *id.*, *ZPE* 112 (1996), 67–8, *id.*, *ZPE* 122 (1998), 47–8, H.-Chr. Günther, *Hellenica* 48 (1998), 7 ("wahrscheinlich ein Amateurprodukt" of Imperial date), M. Campbell *per litteras* "certainly Imperial", C. Mastroiacovo, *RCCM* 40 (1998), 215–27.

Athen. 15.678a, III.498 Kaibel ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἰάκχαν (dett.: ιαχχα A) τινὰ καλούμενον οἶδα στέφανον ὑπὸ Σικυωνίων ὥς φησι Τιμαχίδας ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις. Φιλίτας δ' οὕτως γράφει· 'ἰάκχα ἐν τῇ Σικυωνίᾳ στεφάνωμα εὐῶδες· ἕστηκ' — στέφανον'.

1 ἀμφίκομα A: corr. Schweighäuser

First Brunck 524 and Jacobs 122, followed by Bach 57–8, printed this elegiac couplet as a Philitan fragment, and Wil. 1924 i, 114 n. 2 agreed ("ein Distichon . . . daß von Philitas nur stammen kann"), but it seems that it is a quotation from another poet (from a Sicyonian epigram according to Bergk) in the *At. Gl.* ἰακχαῖος suggests a link with Dionysus/Iacchus, broadly worshipped in wine-producing Sicyon, and Dionysus 'Ανθεύς is associated with wreaths (see *At. Gl.* fr. 40).

1 ἕστηκ' and θηκαμένη (cf. Eur. *Med.* 1160) imply a careful, ceremonial coronation, perhaps one signalling initiation in a rite, cf. in a ritual of Aphrodite *Cypria EGF* 5.2–3 (Nymphs and Charites) πλεξάμεναι στεφάνους εὐωδέας . . ./ἂν κεφαλαῖσιν ἔθεντο and see Blech 302–7. The κόμας are εὐωδέας because of the garland.

2 ἰακχαῖος (= Διονυσιακός) looks like a Hellenistic formation. ἴακχος appears to be an adj. in Eur. *Cycl.* 69–70 ἴακχον, ἴακχον ᾠ-/δὰν (codd.: ᾠδᾷ Kassel) μέλπω, and ἰακχαῖος is attested as the profession of a person in a 2nd/3rd cent. AD inscription from Salamis in Cyprus, J. Pouilloux, *al.*, *Salamine de Chypre* xiii.2, Paris 1987, no 43.2 'Αθηνίων ὁ ἰακ[χα]ῖος καὶ τεχνάρχης.

10. [Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1048 = P. Dub. *CA* 26 = Antim. Dub. fr. 203]

θοὴ δ' ὑπεδέξατο γαῖα

a. EtM 453.6 Gaisf. θοή· σημαίνει πέντε· τὸ μέγα, οἷον 'θοαῖς ἀφροσύναις' (Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1047) ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλαις· καὶ 'θοὴ δ' ὑπεδέξατο γαῖα' etc. **b.** Epim. Hom. θ 25, II.369.37 Dyck σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ μέγα . . . 'θοαῖς ἀφροσύναις' ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλαις· καὶ 'θοὴ δ' ἐπεδέξατο γᾶ', μεγάλη etc.

The fragment is transmitted in discussions of the various meanings of θοός. Maass 1895a, ix n. 5 was induced by Ov. *Met.* 5.423 (Pluto with Persephone on his chariot) *icta viam tellus in Tartara reddit* (cf. Carcin. ii *TrGF* 70 F 5.3 δῦναί τε γαίας εἰς μελαμφαεῖς μυχούς) to ascribe this hemistich to *Demeter.* θοή may mean μέλαινα, see Ll-J —

Parsons on Antim. *SH* 62.2. Matthews on Dub. fr. 203 argued for Antimachean authorship, cf. *id.* 291.

11. [Erat. *CA* 11]

κρῆνης Γαργαφίης

EtG (AB) α 1123, II.172.11 L.-L. (EtM α 1727, II.169.35 L.-L.) Ἀργαφίης· οἷον· 'νιψάμεναι κρῆνης ἔδραμον Ἀργαφίης' ([Call.] *Fr. inc. auct.* 740)·... τὸ δὲ ἐντελὲς ἐν τῷ Ἑρμῇ (ἐν τῇ ερμη' et να super η scr. EtM cod. V^b pace Gaisford 135.32 adn.)· 'κρῆνης Γαργαφίης'. ὁ †Παρμένιος (Παρμενίσκος Bergk: Παρμενίων Meineke: Παρθένιος Sylburg) ἄνευ τοῦ γ̄. ἡ ἔλλειψις ἀπὸ ἱστορίας. οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς ἐν τοῖς Περὶ παθῶν (II.187.2 Lentz; οὕτως — παθῶν om. EtM).

Unger attributed this fragment to P.'s *Hermes*, Hemsterhuis to Erat.'s *Hermes*. Th. Bergk, *Analecta Alexandrina* ii, Marburg 1846, 19 supported the ascription to Erat. "cum illud carmen longe nobilius magisque grammaticorum studiis fuerit explicatum" (from *Hermes* also EtM 472.35 ἴουλος = *CA* 10) and Ed. Hiller, *Eratosthenis Carminum reliquiae*, Lipsiae 1872, 27–31 secured the ascription by drawing attention to the fact that Hermes walked through Boeotia with the stolen cattle of Apollo, *HHHerm.* 88f., Ant. Lib. 23.3.

12. [Euph. *CA* 75]

χθιζόν μοι κνώσσοντι παρ' Ἀργανθώνιον αἶπος

EtG (AB) α 1131 (EtM α 1726) Ἀργανθώνειον· [...] Εὐφορίων δὲ (*CA* 75) καὶ Φιλίτας (fr. 26) Ἀργανθώνιον λέγουσιν διὰ τοῦ ῑ, οἷον 'χθιζόν — αἶπος'.

Bach 58 and Cessi 1914, 286 n. 1 stripped Euph. of this verse to ascribe it to P. Kayser 71 had earlier placed it among his *Fragmenta Incerta et Suspecta*.

G. Dilthey, *De Callimachi Cydippa*, Leipzig 1863, 38 by mistake ascribed [Call.] *Fr. inc. auct.* 739 πολὺ τρύος ἤλασεν ἔξω to P. (see Pfeiffer ad loc.). P. E. Sonnenburg *apud* Nowacki 32 n. 5 mistook a dactylic-sounding formation in Parth. *Erot. path.* 2.2 τῷ δ' ἄρα καὶ αὐτῷ ἦν ἡ μονὴ ἡδομένῳ for Philitan, see fr. 1.2a.

13. Call. *HyAp.* 110–2, see *All. Test.*, Dub. 1.

Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι and Ἑρμηνεία[1]

Fr. 29

ἄ μ φ ω ξ ι ς

a¹. Athen. 11.783d, III.22 Kaibel ἄμφωξις (Kaibel ex Hsch., EtM ll.ss.: ἄμφωτις CE)· ξύλινον ποτήριον, ᾧ χρῆσθαι τοὺς ἀγροίκους Φιλίτας (Φιλητας CE) φησί, {τοὺς} (del. Kaibel) ἀμέλγοντας εἰς αὐτὸ καὶ οὕτως πίνοντας. **a².** de epitome Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1624.30 οὗ δὴ ἀμφώτου παρώνυμον ἡ ἄμφωτις. ξύλινόν φασιν αὐτη ποτήριον, ᾧ χρῆσθαι τοὺς ἀμέλγοντας εἰς αὐτὸ καὶ οὕτω πίνοντας. **b.** Hsch. α 4166, I.146 Lattte ἄμφωξις· ὑδρεῖον ξύλινον ἀγροικικόν, εἰς ὃ καὶ ἀμέλγουσιν. **c.** EtM α 1218, I.459.4 L.-L. ἄμφωξις· ὑδρεῖον ξύλινον, εἰς ὃ ἀμέλγουσιν.

Fr. 30

ἄ ω τ ο ν

a¹. Athen. 11.783a, III.21 Kaibel ἄωτον παρὰ Κυπρίοις τὸ ἔκπωμα, ὡς Πάμφιλος, Φιλίτας (Φιλητας CE) δὲ ποτήριον οὗς οὐκ ἔχον. **a².** hinc Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1429.21 ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοῦ Ἀθηναίου εὕρηται καὶ ποτήριον ἄωτον, ἤτοι τὸ οὗς οὐκ ἔχον. **b.** Suid. α 2860, I.258.8 Adler ἄωτον· . . . ἄωτον δὲ ἀγγεῖον, τὸ μὴ ἔχον ὦτα. **c.** Hsch. α 8997, I.304 Latte ἄωτοι· ὦτα μὴ ἔχοντες.

Fr. 31

γ υ ά λ α

Athen. 11.467c, III.27 Kaibel γυάλα [A (περὶ γύλης in marg.): γυάλα ποτήριον Μεγαρικόν C (γ. ποτήρια Μεγαρικά E): γυάλας Schweighäuser]· Φιλίτας ἐν Ἀτάκτοις Μεγαρέας οὕτω φησὶ καλεῖν τὰ ποτήρια, γυάλας.

---

[1] Numeration as in Kuchenmüller.

Fr. 32

δ ῖ ν ο ς

a[1]**.** Athen. 11.467e–f, III.28 Kaibel Σέλευκος (fr. 48 Müller) δ' εἰπὼν ἐκπώματος εἶναι γένος τὸν δεῖνον παρατίθεται Στράττιδος ἐκ Μηδείας· [*PCG* 35]. [. . .] Κυρηναῖοι (CE: Κυριναῖοι A) δὲ τὸν ποδονιπτῆρα δῖνον (-ι- superscr. -ει- E: δεῖνον A) ὀνομάζουσιν, ὡς Φιλίτας φησὶν ἐν Ἀτάκτοις (Schweighäuser: Ἀττικοῖς A). **a**[2]**.** hinc Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1207.9, IV.404 van der Valk δῖνος δὲ οὐ μόνον τόρνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποδονιπτὴρ κατὰ Κυρηναίους.

Fr. 33

π έ λ λ α

Athen. 11.495e, III.92 Kaibel πέλλα· ἀγγεῖον σκυφοειδές, πυθμένα ἔχον πλατύτερον, εἰς ὃ ἤμελγον τὸ γάλα. Ὅμηρος· [*Il.* 16.640–1]. [. . .] Κλείταρχος δὲ ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις πελλητῆρα μὲν καλεῖν Θεσσαλοὺς καὶ Αἰολεῖς τὸν ἀμολγέα, πέλλαν δὲ τὸ ποτήριον. Φιλίτας δ' ἐν Ἀτάκτοις τὴν κύλικα Βοιωτούς.

Fr. 34

π ρ ο χ ύ τ η ς

Athen. 11.496c, III.93 Kaibel προχύτης· εἶδος ἐκπώματος, ὡς Σιμάριστος ἐν τετάρτῳ Συνωνύμων. Ἴων δ' ὁ Χῖος ἐν Ἐλεγείοις· 'ἡμῖν δὲ κρητῆρ' οἰνοχόοι θέραπες/κιρνάντων προχύταισιν ἐν ἀργυρέοις' (*IEG* 27.2–3). Φιλίτας (A: Φιλήτας CE) δ' ἐν Ἀτάκτοις ἀγγεῖον ξύλινον, ἀφ' οὗ τοὺς ἀγροίκους πίνειν (hic desin. CE). μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος †ἐν τιγονι† (Alexander Com. *PCG* Dub. 4).

Fr. 35

σ κ α λ λ ί ο ν

a. Athen. 11.498a, III.97 Kaibel σκαλλίον (Casaubon ex Hsch. l.s.: κάλλιον A)· κυλίκιον μικρόν, ᾧ σπένδουσιν Αἰολεῖς, ὡς Φιλίτας φησὶν ἐν Ἀτάκτοις. **b.** Hsch. σ 817, IV.37 Schmidt σκαλλίον· κυλίκιον μικρόν. οἱ δὲ σκαλλόν.

Fr. 36

ἀ μ ό ρ α ι

Athen. 14.646d, III.429 Kaibel ἀμόραι· τὰ μελιτώματα Φιλίτας ἐν Ἀτάκτοις ἀμόρας φησὶν καλεῖσθαι. μελιτώματα δ' ἐστὶν (<μέλιτι> Kaibel) πεπεμμένα.

Fr. 37

κ ρ ῆ ϊ ο ν

Athen. 14.645d, III.426 Kaibel κρῆϊον (A: κηρίον Kaibel ex Hsch. κ 2546)· πλακοῦς ἄρτος, ὃν Ἀργεῖοι παρὰ τῆς νύμφης πρὸς τὸν νυμφίον φέρουσιν. ὀπτᾶται δ' ἐν ἄνθραξιν, καὶ καλοῦνται ἐπ' αὐτὸν οἱ φίλοι, παρατίθεται δὲ μετὰ μέλιτος, ὥς φησιν Φιλίτας ἐν Ἀτάκτοις.

Fr. 38

κ ύ π ε λ λ α

Athen. 11.483a, III.63 Kaibel κύπελλον· [. . .] Σιμάριστος δὲ τὸ ἄωτον (Herwerden, *Lex. gr.* i 1910, 395: δίωτον A) ποτήριον Κυπρίους, τὸ δὲ δίωτον καὶ τετράωτον Κρῆτας. Φιλίτας δὲ Συρακοσίους κύπελλα καλεῖν τὰ τῆς μάζης καὶ τῶν ἄρτων ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης καταλείμματα.

Fr. 39

σ π ο δ ε ύ ς

Athen. 3.114e, I.263 Kaibel (inter ἄρτων εἴδη plurima) Φιλίτας (Φιλητας ACE) δ' ἐν τοῖς Ἀτάκτοις σποδέα (Schweighäuser: σπολέα ACE) καλεῖσθαί τινα ἄρτον, ὃν ὑπὸ τῶν συγγενῶν (ACE: ἐγγενῶν Kaibel) μόνον καταναλίσκεσθαι.

Fr. 40

ἰ ά κ χ α

a. Athen. 15.678a, III.498 Kaibel ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἰάκχαν (dett.: ιαχχα A) τινὰ καλούμενον οἶδα στέφανον ὑπὸ Σικυωνίων, ὥς φησι Τιμαχίδας ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις (fr. 19 Blinkenberg). Φιλίτας δ' οὕτως γράφει· 'ἰάκχα ἐν τῇ Σικυωνίᾳ στεφάνωμα εὐῶδες· 'ἔστηκ' ἀμφὶ κόμας (Schweighäuser: ἀμφίκομα A) εὐωδέας ἀγχόθι πατρός/καλὸν ἰακχαῖον θηκαμένη

στέφανον" (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 9). **b[1].** Hsch. ι 21, II.341 Latte ἰάκχα· στεφάνωμα εὐῶδες ἐν Σικυῶνι. **b[2,3].** id. θ 567, II.323 Latte [θιάκχα· ἄνθη ἐν Σικυῶνι], id. ι 5, II.341 Latte [ἰάγχετον· στεφάνωμα].

Fr. 41

ἴ σ θ μ ι ο ν

Athen. 15.677c, III.497 Kaibel ἰσθμιακόν. οὕτως τοῦτον καλούμενον στέφανον Ἀριστοφάνης μνήμης ἠξίωσεν ἐν Ταγηνισταῖς λέγων οὕτως· [*PCG* 505]. Σιληνὸς δ' ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις φησίν· 'ἴσθμιον· στέφανον'. Φιλίτας δέ φησι· '<ἴσθμιον·> (Fränkel, <ἴσθμιος> Kaibel) στέφανος ἤγουν ὁμωνυμία ἀμφοτέρωθι, οἷον τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ τοῦ †πρώτου (περὶ αὐτῆς?) κόσμου. λέγω δὲ <καὶ> (suppl. Fränkel) τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ φρέατος καὶ τοῦ ἐγχειριδίου ἴσθμιον' (CE: ἴσθιον A: <περιστόμιον> ἴσθ. e lexicogr. Fränkel). Τιμαχίδας δὲ (fr. 28 Blinkenberg) καὶ Σιμμίας (fr. 29 Fränkel) οἱ Ῥόδιοι ἀποδιδόασιν ἓν ἀνθ' ἑνὸς 'ἴσθμιον· στέφανον'. οὗ μνημονεύει καὶ Καλλίξεινος ὁ Ῥόδιος καὶ αὐτὸς γένος, ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας γράφων οὕτως· . . . (*FGrH* 627 F 4; Callixeni verba perierunt).

Fr. 42

ὑ π ο θ υ μ ί ς

Athen. 15.678d, III.499 Kaibel ὑποθυμὶς δὲ καὶ ὑποθυμίδες (Kaibel: -ιάδες A) στέφανοι παρ' Αἰολεῦσιν καὶ Ἴωσιν, οὓς περὶ τοὺς τραχήλους περιετίθεντο, ὡς σαφῶς ἔστιν μαθεῖν ἐκ τῆς Ἀλκαίου καὶ Ἀνακρέοντος ποιήσεως (ibid. 15.674c–d). Φιλίτας (A: Φιλήτας CE) δ' ἐν τοῖς Ἀτάκτοις ὑποθυμίδα (Kaibel: -ίδας A) Λεσβίους φησὶν καλεῖν μυρσίνης κλῶνα, περὶ ὃν πλέκειν ἴα καὶ ἄλλα ἄνθη.

Fr. 43

ἕ λ ι ν ο ς

a. EtG (AB) ε 384 L. (EtM (POR) ε 402 L.) ἑλινός· ἡ ἄμπελος, ὡς Ἀπολλόδωρος (*FGrH* 244 F 247). Φιλήτας (Φιλῆτας PO) δ' ἐν Γλώσσαις τὸν κλάδον τῆς ἀμπέλου (ὡς Ἀπολλόδ. — Γλώσσαις B: ἢ A). Νίκανδρος ἐν Θηριακοῖς (*Alex.* 181; Νίκ. — Θηριακοῖς praeb. EtM). **b.** Σ Nic. *Alex.* 181f, p. 88 Geymonat ἑλίνοιο· τοῦ κλάδου τῆς ἀμπέλου. **c.** Hsch. ε 1998, II.64 Latte ἑλινοί (Latte ex EtM: ἕλενοι H)· κλήματα {τὰ} (del. Latte) τῶν ἀμπέλων.

Fr. 44

ὄ μ π ν ι ο ς

Σ A.R. 4.989i, 302.7 Wendel στάχυν ὄμπνιον· πολύν, δαψιλῆ. Φιλητᾶς ἐν Ἀτάκτοις γλώσσαις ἀπέδωκε 'ὄμπνιον στάχυν' τὸν εὔχυλον καὶ τρόφιμον. Κυρηναίων δέ τινες τὸν πλούσιον καὶ εὐδαίμονα ὄμπνιον καλοῦσιν. ἄμεινον δὲ τὸν φερέσβιον εἰπεῖν, οἱονεὶ ἔμπνοόν τινα ὄντα καὶ ὄμπνιον.

Fr. 45

ἀ χ α ι α ί

a[1]. Orion Koes. 185.32 Sturz Ἀχαιά· ἡ Δημήτηρ παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς. εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ ἄχος τῆς λύπης. οὕτω Δίδυμος (fr. 49 Schmidt). καὶ ὅτι μετὰ κυμβάλων ἠχοῦσα τὴν Κόρην ἐζήτει. ἤ, ὡς Φιλήτας, τὰς ἐρίθους ἀχαιὰς ἐκάλουν. **a[2].** hinc EtGud. auct. (d) 248.13 de Stefani (ubi Φιλητᾶς d, Φιλητάς d[2]). **b[1].** Hsch. α 8806, I.297 Latte Ἀχαία· ἐπίθετον Δήμητρος . . . οἱ δὲ ˌἔρια ρ μαλακά. **b[2].** id. α 8877, I.300 Latte [ἀχιά· ἔρια μαλακά].

Fr. 46

ἄ μ α λ λ α ι

a. Hsch. α 3417, I.120 Latte ἄμαλλαι (Alberti: -α H)· δράγματα, δέσμη (-αι Blaydes) τῶν ἀσταχύων. Σοφοκλῆς Τριπτολέμῳ (fr. 607). ἀγκάλη, δράγματα ρ', ὥς φησι Ἴστρος (*FGrH* 334 F 62), Φιλίτας δὲ ἱστορεῖ ἐκ σ'. καὶ Ὅμηρος χρῆται τῇ λέξει. **b.** Σ K Theoc. 10.44a, 235.22 Wendel ἀμαλοδέται δὲ (Wendel: ὡς K, post quod <ἀμαλοδετῆρες> Ziegler) οἱ τὰς ἀμάλας συνδέοντες. ἀμάλη δὲ συνέστηκεν ἐκ δραγμάτων ρ' ἢ καὶ σ'. **c.** EtG (AB) α 581, I.370.14 L.-L. (EtSym. α 723, I.370.25 L.-L., EtM α 1007, I.371.30 L.-L.) ἀμαλλοδετῆρες· οἱ τὰς ἀμάλλας δεσμοῦντες. ἄμαλλα δὲ ἡ ἐκ πολλῶν δραγμάτων συναγωγή.

Fr. 47

β α ῖ β υ ξ

a. Hsch. β 71, I.307 Latte βαίβυκος· πελεκᾶνος (L. Dindorf: βαβυκως πελεκαν ως H) Φιλίτας. Ἀμερίας (Musurus (Ἀμ. δὲ Dobree): αμεριασας H) βαυβυκᾶνας (O. Hoffmann cl. β 355: βαυκαλας H).

b. Choerob. ad Theod. 1352, I.80.18 Hilgard = Herodian. II.741.37 Lentz βαῖβυξ, βαίβυκος· βαίβυκες δὲ λέγονται οἱ πελεκᾶνες.

Fr. 48

π ρ ό ξ

a[1]. Σ A.R. 2.279a, 148.7 Wendel ἠὲ πρόκας ἰχν<εύοντες>· ζῷόν τι ὅμοιον ἐλάφῳ, ὁ λεγόμενος νεβρός. Διονύσιος δέ φησιν ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἐν ταῖς Κτίσεσι (corr. Sylburg in EtG l.s.: κυήσεσι codd.; Dion. Chalc. fr. 12, IV.395 Müller) τὰς ἐλάφους οὕτω λέγεσθαι, πρόκας· ὅθεν καὶ Προκόννησος [. . .]. Φιλητᾶς (P: -ιτᾶς L) δέ φησι πρόκας λέγεσθαι ἐλάφους τὰς πρώτως τικτομένας, οἷον πρωτοτόκους. **a**[2]. inde EtG (AB; apud Wendel l.c.) πρόκας· [A.R. 2.279]. πρόξ ἐστι ζῷον μικρὸν (μ. om. EtM, hab. 'Zon.') ὅμοιον ἐλάφῳ, ὁ λεγόμενος νεβρός. Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ (ὁ add. EtM) Ἀθηναῖος ἐν ταῖς Κτίσεσι (Sylburg: Κτή- AB) οὕτως λέγεσθαί <φησι> (Kulencamp, λέγει Et-M) τὰς ἐλάφους, πρόκας· ὅθεν καὶ Προκόννησος (οὕτως — Προκόννησος praeb. EtM) [. . .]. Φιλητᾶς δέ φησι πρόκας λέγεσθαι τὰς ἐλάφους τὰς πρῶτον τικτομένας, οἷον πρωτοτόκους (, ὡς παρὰ Ἀπολλωνίῳ add. EtM). **a**[3, 4]. eadem fere EtM 689.15 Gaisf. Προικόννησος, 'Zonaras' col. 1579 Tittm. πρόκας.

Fr. 49

σ κ ῖ ρ ο ς

Hsch. σ 893, IV.41 Schmidt σκεῖρος· ῥύπος. καὶ ὁ δριμὺς τυρός. καὶ ἄλσος καὶ δρυμὸς (Aristarch. ad *Il.* 23.332–3). Φιλητᾶς δὲ τὴν ῥυπώδη (Meineke: πυρρωδη H) γῆν.

Fr. 50

σ κ ύ ζ η

Hsch. σ 1148, IV.51 Schmidt σκύζης· παρὰ Φιλίτᾳ· 'παύσω σε τῆς σκύζης', ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς κάπρας.

Fr. 51

ὑ π' α ὐ ν ή ν†

Hsch. υ 262, IV.200 Schmidt ὑπ' αὐνήν† (fort. ὑπ' αὐλήν, cf. υ 260)· παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ (Musurus: παρεκατεω H; *FGrH* 1 F 365). Φιλίτας.

Fr. 52

ὑ π ε ζ ῶ σ θ α ι

Hsch. υ 274, IV.201 Schmidt ὑπεζῶσθαι· τὸ εἰς ἄνδρας (Salmasius: αλιδρας H) ἐλθεῖν. Φιλήτας.

Fr. 53

μ ε λ α γ κ ρ ά ν ι ν ο ς

Strabo 3.5.1, II.83 Lassere (incolae insularum Balearidum) ἄζωστοι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐξῄεσαν . . . σφενδόνας δὲ περὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ τρεῖς μελαγκρανίνας (Coraes: μελαγκραΐνας codd. ambo locis) {μελαγκρανίνας (-ανίς Meineke)· σχοίνου εἶδος, ἐξ οὗ πλέκεται τὰ σχοινία· καὶ Φιλήτας γε (Coraes: τε codd.) ἐν Ἑρμηνείᾳ· 'λευγαλέος δὲ χιτὼν πεπινωμένος, ἀμφὶ δ' ἀραιὴ/ἶξὺς εἰλεῖται (Salmasius: ἰλεῖται codd.) κόμμα μελαγκράνινον' (*All. Poet. Ascr.* 2), ὡς σχοίνῳ ἐζωσμένου} ἢ τριχίνας ἢ νευρίνας.

Fr. 54

Σ A (Did.) *Il.* 1.524c, I.142 Erbse κεφαλῇ κατανεύσομαι: οὕτως 'κατανεύσομαι', οὐχὶ 'ἐπινεύσομαι' Ἀρίσταρχος ἐν τοῖς Πρὸς Φιλητᾶν (T. 10) προφέρεται.

3 Φιλιτᾶν A: Φιλίταν olim Erbse, at v. T. 10

Fr. 55

Σ A (Did.) *Il.* 2.111b, I.202 Erbse {Ζεύς με} μέγα {Κρονίδης}: σχολικὸν ἀγνόημα τὸ δοκεῖν Ζηνοδότειον εἶναι τὴν μετὰ τοῦ σ̄ γραφήν. [. . .] εἰ γὰρ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ὑπομνημάτων προτάτ<τ>οιμεν, ἕνεκα γοῦν τἀκριβοῦς γράφοιμεν κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον 'Ζεύς με μέγας'. ἐν γοῦν τῷ Πρὸς Φιλίταν συγγράμματι τῇ γραφῇ κέχρηται, δύο λέγων τὸ μέγας σημαίνειν, τοτὲ μὲν τὸ καθ' αὑτό, καθάπερ νῦν 'Ζεύς με μέγα<ς> Κρονίδης' καὶ 'κεῖτο μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἱπποσυνάων' (*Il.* 16.776), τοτὲ δὲ αὖ τὸ πρὸς τὴν κατὰ τὸν Αἴαντα τὸν ἕτερον διάκρισιν 'Αἴας δ' ὁ μέγας' (*Il.* 9.169).

1 del. Dindorf **3** τῶι A: corr. Bekker **4** suppl. Villoison **5** Φιλήταν malit post Kuchenmüller Erbse *Schol. Il.* vii, 276 (Corrigenda et Supplenda ad loc.) **7** suppl. Villoison **8** αὐτὸ A: corr. Lehrs

Fr. 56

Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 2.269c, I.242–3 Erbse {ἀλγήσας δ'} ἀχρεῖον ἰδών: ὅτι Φιλητᾶς τὸ 'ἰδών' περισπᾷ, οἷον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ἰδεῶν. οὐδέποτε δὲ Ὅμηρος ἰδέας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶπεν. ἔστιν οὖν τὸ 'ἀχρεῖον ἰδών' εὐτελῶς σχηματίσας. | Cf. gloss. interl. cod. A ad loc., II.312.33 Dindorf ἰδών: ὀξύνεται· μετοχὴ γάρ ἐστι.

1 ἀλγήσας δ' in lemmate del. Villoison | fort. <ἡ διπλή,> ὅτι Erbse **2** Φιλιτᾶς A **4** ἐντελῶς A: emend. R. van Bennekom *LFrE* i, 1779.9

Fr. 57

a. Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 21.126–7a, V.148 Erbse θρώσκων τις κατὰ κῦμα μέλαιναν φρῖχ' ὑπαΐξει </ἰχθύς, ὅς κε φάγησι — δημόν>: πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον· Φιλητᾶς γὰρ καὶ Καλλίστρατος (p. 155 Barth) γράφουσι 'φρῖχ' ὑπαλύξει', λέγοντες ὅτι οἱ πίονες τῶν ἰχθύων καὶ εὔτροφοι τὸ ψῦχος ὑπομένουσι καὶ οὐ φθείρονται. ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς οὐδέποτε φρίκην τὸ ψῦχος εἴρηκεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκ γαλήνης πρῶτον ἐξορθούμενον κῦμα. | Cf. Σ A^{im} ibid. b^2 οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος, ἄλλοι δὲ 'ὑπαλύξει'. **b.** Σ bT (ex) ibid. c, V.152 Erbse Φιλίτας δὲ ἀρεσκόμενος τῇ 'ὑπαλύξει' γραφῇ φησιν ὡς ἐκεῖνος ὁ λιπανθεὶς ἰχθὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ δημοῦ τὴν ψυχρασίαν ὑπαλύξει. **c.** POxy. 221.iv.26–32, pap. saec. p.C. II, edd. Grenfell-Hunt (1899), V.86 Erbse Φιλήτας καὶ Καλλίστρατος] | δὲ 'ὑ[παλύξει . . . ὅτι ὁ] | ἰχθ[ὺς ὁ Λυκάονος τὸν δημὸν φαγὼν] | π{ε}ιμ[ελώδης γενόμενος τὸ κρύ] | ος φε[ύξεται. ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὅτι τὸ δια] | νεστ[ηκὸς τῆς θαλάσσης ἐπιπολῆς,] | οὐ τὸ κ[ρύος φησὶν Ὅμηρος φρῖκα]. **d.** Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 6.459, II.209 Erbse εἴπῃσιν: ὅτι τὸ 'εἴπῃσιν' ἀντὶ τοῦ εἴποι ἄν. ἡ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς Φιλητᾶν γράφοντα 'θρώσκων τις κατὰ κῦμα μέλαιναν φρῖχ' ὑπαλύξει'. οὗτος γὰρ μὴ νοήσας ὅτι τὸ 'ὑπαΐξει' ἐστὶ τὸ ἐφορμῆσαι ὑπὸ τὴν φρῖκα, τουτέστι τὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπανάστημα, ὃς φάγοι ἂν Λυκάονος τοῦ δημοῦ, {τὴν} φρῖκα ἐδέξατο τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψύχους γενομένην φρίκην καί φησι τοὺς πιμελώδεις τῶν ἰχθύων ὑπομένειν τὸ ψῦχος, ὥστε ὃς ἂν τὸ τοῦ Λυκάονος λίπος φάγῃ, ἐκκλινεῖ τὴν φρίκην. **e.** Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 8.171a, II.258 Erbse <ὅς καὶ λάχῃσιν>: . . . ἡ δὲ ἀναφορὰ πρὸς τὸ 'ἰχθύς, ὅς κε φάγῃσι' πρὸς Φιλητᾶν. **f.** Porph. *QH* 1.45.13 Sodano Φιλητᾶς δὲ τῇ 'ὑπαλύξει' γραφῇ συντιθέμενός φησιν ὅτι κτλ.

a1 diple ante utrumque versum in A **2** lemma suppl. Friedländer **2–3** <ἡ διπλῆ> πρὸς Villoison, <αἱ διπλαὶ> πρὸς malit Erbse **3** Φιλήτας post Kuchenmüller Erbse **c** omnia sic restituit Erbse in primis Porphyrio l.s. nixus **12** v. 26 sic suppleverit Erbse, Φιλήτας] iam Grenfell-Hunt **14** εσφε[Pap. **17** ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι Villoison **18** Φιλητὰ A | γράφοντι A: corr. Villoison **19** fort. ὑπαΐξαι Erbse **21** δήμου A: corr. Bekker | τὴν ante φρῖκα Erbse auctore deleverim **22** πημελώδεις A: corr. Villoison **24** φάγοι A: corr. Friedländer **27** Φιλητᾶς plurr.: ητάς E^4: -ήτας *B

Fr. 58

a. Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1235.39 ad 21.252, IV.496 van der Valk τὸ δὲ 'αἰετοῦ οἴματ' ἔχων' Φιλήτας, φασί, γράφει 'αἰετοῦ ὄμματ' ἔχων'. κρεῖττον δὲ τὸ 'οἴματα', ᾧ ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὸ 'οἴμησε δ' ἀλείς' (*Il.* 22.308). **b^1.** Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 22.308a^1, V.324 Erbse οἴμησεν δὲ ἀλεὶς <ὥς τ' αἰετὸς ὑψιπετήεις>: ὅτι κἀκεῖ (*Il.* 21.252) γραπτέον 'αἰετοῦ οἴματ' ἔχων', οὐχ ὡς Φιλητᾶς 'ὄμματα'. **b^2.** Σ T ibid. a^2 κἀκεῖ οὖν 'αἰετοῦ οἴματ' ἔχων', οὐκ ὄμματα.

2–3 οἴματ(α) bis et οἴμησε spiritu aspero munita **5** fort. <ἡ διπλῆ,> ὅτι Erbse **6** Φιλήτας post Kuchenmüller Erbse

Ataktoi Glossai and *Hermeneia*

I. *Commentary*

Fr. 29

ἄμφωξις, from ἀμφί + οχ (< ἔχω) with lengthening of the thematic vowel,[1] denotes an apparently capacious wooden pail, equipped with two crude handles at its middle, which one can hold by both sides. Crude, wooden objects of large size are appropriate to rural life, cf. Neoptolemus of Parion *Glossai* fr. 10.9 (Athen. 11.477a; κισσύβιον) λέγεται ἐπὶ συνόδου ἀγροικικῆς, ἔνθα προσήκει μάλιστα τὸ ξύλινον ποτήριον (see Blümner ii, 327), Alcm. *PMGF* 56.3–4 μέγαν σκύφον,/οἷά τε ποιμένες ἄνδρες ἔχοισιν. Herdsmen are said to milk in an ἄμφωξις and then directly (and greedily?) drink from it (οὕτως πίνοντας), perhaps holding it on both sides. A possible usage of this word in a satyric drama or comedy may be suggested by Hsch. α 4170 ἄμφωτις· γαστρίμαργος, ἀκρατής "scl. quae poculum auribus tenus attolit" (Latte) or by Alexis' comedy Ἀμφωτίς (*PCG* ii, 30). Athen. understood this as a mere cup (ποτήριον) with two ears and therefore wrote ἄμφωτις etymologising ἀμφί + οὖς, cf. Eustath. *Comm. Od. l.c.* This is an easy alteration perhaps effected by a paretymology of ἄμφωτις by P. or by the attestation of ἄμφωτις denoting a drinking vessel in the Alexandrian? grammarian Hermonax ἐν Συνωνύμοις (Athen. 11.480f).[2] ἄμφωτον (adj.) of a goblet occurs as a Homeric hapax in *Od.* 22.9–10 ἄλεισον . . ./. . ἄμφωτον (varied in Theoc. 1.27–8 κισσύβιον . . ./ἀμφῶες) and it is conceivable that ἄμφωξις was brought up by P. in the dis-

---

[1] As in εὐωχία, διωχῆς (cf. Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 882.13 (III.318 van der Valk) διωχῆς . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ δύο ἔχειν, see K-A on Pherecr. *PCG* 3), or Hes. *Theog.* 690 συνωχαδόν, Thuc. 4.97.4 ὁμωχέτας, Hsch. δ 2697 δυσωχεῖν· δυσχεραίνειν, π 4111 προωχῆς ἵππος, see Chantraine *DE* s.v. ἔχω (5). Arnott 1996, 83 suggested that this may be "the spelling of an originally non-Greek word for 'milk-pail', later corrupted to ἄμφωτις by popular etymology".

[2] This rustic ἄμφωτις is well attested, cf., other than Hermonax *l.l.*, Pollux 10.275 ἀμφωτίδες in an agricultural list ἐκ τῶν σκευῶν, Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 308.44 (I.479 van der Valk) αἱ ἀμφώτιδες, ποτηρίου εἶδος ἐκ τῶν ἐν ζώοις ὠτίων παρονομασθέν, *ibid.* 1324.38 (IV.816 van der Valk). See also Arnott 1996, 83 on Alexis' Ἀμφωτίς, M. I. Gulleta in *LVG*, 171f.

cussion of this Homeric rarity. If so, this and the following fragment may be remnants of the same entry.

Fr. 30

Athen. seems to preserve a verbatim quotation from Pamphilus: Φιλίτας δὲ ποτήριον οὗς οὐκ ἔχον. Pamphilus might here rely on Simaristus, if an emendation by H. van Herwerden in Athen. 11.483a (fr. 38) is, as it seems, correct, (κύπελλον) Σιμάριστος δὲ τὸ ἄωτον (Herwerden: δίωτον A) ποτήριον Κυπρίους, τὸ δὲ δίωτον καὶ τετράωτον Κρῆτας. Call. fr. 399 (*HE* 68) ἔρχεται πολὺς μὲν Αἰγαῖον διατμήξας ἀπ' οἰνηρῆς Χίου/ἀμφορεύς, πολὺς δὲ Λεσβίης (-ιην P: corr. Bentley) ἄωτος νέκταρ (ἄωτοννέκταρ P: corr. Pfeiffer) οἰνάνθης ἄγων used the vocable of large wine jars.[3] The contrast between πολὺς . . ./ἀμφορεύς and πολὺς . . . ἄωτος in Call. may suggest that P. opposed ἄωτος to ἄμφωτος, possibly in a discussion of the Homeric hapax ἄμφωτον (*Od.* 22.10, cf. fr. 29). ἄμφωτον is expounded by Apoll. Soph. 28.3 as ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν ὦτα ἔχοντα, cf. Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1624.31 ἀνάπαλιν δὲ τῷ ἀμφώτῳ ἔχει τὸ ἄωτον ποτήριον . . . ὡς ἱστορεῖ 'Αθήναιος. Similarly, Moeris α 91 expounded ἀμφορέα as τὸν δίωτον στάμνον. The term is then varied by Theoc. *HE* 20.2–3 ξόανον/. . . ἀνούατον (codd.: ἀνούτατον *perperam* C. Trypanis, *CPh* 65 (1970), 51) of a crude rustic effigy, cf. Aët. 1.135 ὀστράκινον ἀγγεῖον ἄωτον . . μακροτράχηλον. ἄωτον would be of low origin: if the four 'ears' with which Nestor's cup is equipped are an indication of luxury (*Il.* 11.633–4 οὔατα δ' αὐτοῦ/τέσσαρ' ἔσαν), this would be an artless cup of simple people. This might again imply satyric drama or comedy. Suid. α 2860 might suggest that Hsch. α 8997 > α 9000 ἄωτος· . . . ἢ μὴ ἔχον ὦτα might have once contained material related to the information in Athenaeus.

---

[3] G-P ad loc. rejected ἄωτος since the term could allegedly apply only to "a drinking vessel, not a container" and their view was adopted "with some doubt" by G. B. d'Alessio, *Callimaco* i, Milan 1996, 275 n. 89. However, P.'s ποτήριον may be due to the possible Homeric lemma ἄλεισον (ἄμφωτον), while adj. ἄωτος can apply to any handless vessel, as do ἄμφωτος or μόνωτος. Cf. Suid. α 2860 *ἀγγεῖον*, τὸ μὴ ἔχον ὦτα and see Schmitt 108 n. 34, M. I. Gulleta in *LVG*, 342–3. For this meaning of οὗς, applicable to virtually any vessel, see F-G on *Od.* 22.475.

Fr. 31

The Megarian gloss γυάλα (= γυάλη) may be of literary provenance here if, as it seems, it is correctly restored in Dionysius of Sinope (4th cent. BC) καταλέγων ὀνόματα ποτηρίων (Athen. 11.467d), *PCG* 5.1–2 ὅσα δ' ἐστὶν εἴδη Θηρικλείων τῶν καλῶν,/γυάλαι (Letronne: γύναι· A) δικότυλοι, τρικότυλοι, δῖνος μέγας. It is apparently of the same origin as the Macedonian name of a cultic cup called γυάλας, of which Athen. goes on to report that it was discussed by a certain Parthenius in the first book of his work Περὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς λέξεων ζητουμένων with reference to Marsyas of Philippoi *FGrH* (135–)136 F 21,[4] a 3rd cent. BC historian who wrote Μακεδονικαὶ ἱστορίαι in at least six books, cf. Hsch. γ 990 γυλλάς· εἶδος ποτηρίου, παρὰ Μακεδόσιν, EtM 243.13 γυάλας and see Hoffmann 71. Both forms derive from stem *γυ- 'curve' + suffix -αλ-, which "a servi à constituer des mots techniques ou familiers dont il ne pas possible de serrer de près la structure".[5] Hsch. γ 967 <γύαλα·> ποτήρια and EtM 243.10 γύαλα· . . . ποτήρια show that there existed a word γύαλον 'cup', whose meaning is probably a semantic evolution out of the primary sense 'rounded hollow', cf. Eur. *IA* 1051–52 χρυσέοισιν ἄφυσσε λοι-/βὰν ἐκ (ed. Heruagiana^2: ἐν L) κρατήρων γυάλοις.

Schweighäuser attempted to establish γυάλας in both places without good reason; for the repetition cf. fr. 48 πρόκας . . . Διονύσιος δέ φησιν . . . τὰς ἐλάφους οὕτω λέγεσθαι, πρόκας, fr. 36, Athen. 11.478b κότυλος· τὰ μόνωτα ποτήρια κότυλοι etc. P.'s discussion may have been generated from his research on the controversial Homeric phrase θώρηκος γύαλον. For a possible context cf. Hsch. θ 1016 (Diog.) θώρηκος γύαλον· . . . ζητοῦσι δέ, πῶς πληγέντος κατὰ τοῦ ὤμου τοῦ Διομήδους φησί· 'θώρηκος γύαλον' (*Il.* 5.99); πρὸς οὓς λεκτέον, ὅτι πᾶν τὸ κοῖλον γύαλον λέγεται, cf. Apoll. Soph. 89.14 καθόλου γύαλα παρὰ τοῖς ποιηταῖς ὀνομάζεται τὰ κοιλώματα.[6] A misinterpretation of

---

[4] Rather than of Pella (*FGrH* 135), ὁ πρεσβύτερος (4th cent. BC), who wrote Μακεδονικά in ten books. See W. Heckel, *Hermes* 108 (1980), 461.

[5] Chantraine 1933, 246, see also Risch 108, B-P 4. For the glosses γυάλας/γυάλα see *LSJ Suppl.*, *DGE* s.v. Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 656 n. 60 restored this root in Athen. 9.399b Σιμάριστος ἐν γ' Συνωνύμων οὕτως γράφει· 'ὀσφύος αἱ ἐκ πλαγίων σάρκες ἐπανεστηκυῖαι ψύαι, τὰ δ' ἑκατέρωθεν κοιλώματα λέγουσι κύβους γυλλάδας (: γαλλιας A, "quid sit nescio" olim Kaibel)'.

[6] Similar interpretations were advanced for the Homeric hapax *Od.* 9.223 γαυλός 'milk-pail', cf. Σ T ad loc. (II.424 Dindorf) πᾶν δὲ τὸ κοῖλον γαυλὸν . . . ἐκάλουν and see Ebeling s.v., Magnelli on Alex. Aet. (his) fr. 3.20.

Il. 5.189 διὰ θώρηκος γυάλοιο may have effected the employment of this term as an adj. in Call. *Hec.* fr. 10.1 γυαλὸν λίθον '*hollow* rock' (Leumann 1950, 163–4). These references might imply that Aristarchus may have taken issue with P. with regards to this term.

Fr. 32

Several meanings of δ(ε)ῖνος (< *διν- 'whirl round') are illustrated in Athenaeus with passages mostly from comedy. The word is known as a denomination of round vessels of different sizes, cf. Hsch. δ 508 δεῖνος· . . . εἶδος ἐκπόματος, Σ vet. Ar. *Nub.* 381 (95.3 Holwerda) κεραμεοῦν . . βαθὺ ποτήριον and see K-A on Strattis *PCG* 35.2, *DGE* s.v. IV.2, A. M. Bowie, *JHS* 117 (1997), 5 n. 32, but the meaning ποδονιπτήρ from Doric Cyrene is attested only in *Ataktoi.* This piece of information may have been supplied by P. from a comic passage in a discussion of the Homeric term δίνη, δινωτός or the like. Seleucus Hom. *Glossai* fr. 48 Müller (Athen. 11.467e), in his own discussion of δῖνος, adduced Strattis *l.l.* Eratosthenes in his lengthy studies on ancient comedy might have first taken it up, given his penchant for relating Cyrenean terms in the exegesis of Attic comedy.[7] The orthodox spelling is δῖνος — Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1207.9 was unsure — see K-A on Apollophan. *PCG* 1.

Fr. 33

This is another term of humble, bucolic origin.[8] Athen. (i.e. Pamphilus) says that according to Clitarch ἐν ταῖς Γλώσσαις, the Thessalians and Aeolians call πελλητήρ the ἀμολγεύς, a rare term[9] expounded in Σ [Theoc.] 8.87a (213.7 Wendel) as ἀγγεῖον δεκτικὸν γάλακτος, whereas they call πέλλαν . . τὸ ποτήριον. Athen. adds that P. in *Ataktoi*

---

[7] Erat. Περὶ ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας fr. 18 Strecker compares the dialect of Cyrene with with that of Attica, and Strecker, on this basis, attributed frr. 29, 52 and 90 to him, see Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 655 and in general Pfeiffer 1968, 161, Fraser i, 457–8. For Erat. possibly picking up information from P. cf. fr. 49.

[8] For modern discussions on πέλλα see Leumann 1950, 267–8 (he mistook πελλίς = ποτήριον in Hippon. *IEG* 13.1, perhaps due to its misplacement in *LSJ* s.v. I.2 'drinking cup', corrected in *LSJ Suppl.* s.v.), Chantraine *DE* s.v., Erbse on Σ *Il.* 16.642 (IV.286), E. Degani, *Studi su Ipponatte* i, Bari 1984, 6f., A. Rengakos, *ZPE* 102 (1994), 123–4. *Realia* in F. Eckstein, *AH* L, 41, G. Bruns, *AH* Q, 42.

[9] [Theoc.] 8.87, Crinag. *GPh* 23.1. Frisk s.v. πέλλα compared ἀντλητήρ 'ladle' in Athen. 10.424a. Cf. also Hsch. π 1340 πελλαντῆρα· ἀμολγέα, i.e. 'vase à traire' Chantraine *l.c.*, not 'one who milks into a pail' as in *LSJ* s.v.

equated πέλλα with κύλιξ following a Boeotian usage. It is plain that Clitarch, influenced by P., attributes to πέλλα the same meaning relying on usages in dialectically related regions. It would then seem that πέλλα is a (mostly wooden) vessel broad enough to be apt for milking and drinking, akin to fr. 29 ἄμφωξις and fr. 35 προχύτης.

P.'s discussion of πέλλα may have resulted from its hapax occurrence as 'milk-pail' in a simile in *Il.* 16.642. Hippon. *IEG* 14 is quoted by Athen. as employing the word with the same meaning.[10] Next, in Adesp. *PMG* 997.8 ([Pind.] fr. 104b.8) πέλλαι . . ξύλιναι, in a fragment describing the copious supply of milk foreboding an epiphany of Apollo in Galaxium (Boeotia), Theoc. 1.26, Nic. *Alex.* 262, 311, cf. Hsch. π 1342 πέλλας καὶ πέλλαι· ποιμενικὰ ἀγγεῖα, Pollux 10.78 > Adesp. *TrGF* 595, most probably from a satyric drama.[11]

πελλίς is expressly contrasted to κύλιξ in Hippon. *IEG* 13.1–2 ἐκ πελλίδος πίνοντες· οὐ γὰρ ἦν αὐτῇ/κύλιξ, cf. Athenaeus' comment δι' ἀπορίαν δὲ κύλικος ἐχρῶντο τῇ πελλίδι. But a Boeotian usage employs πέλλα as 'drinking cup'. The term occurs in this sense in Lyc. 708 (Zeus established the Stygian oath) λοιβῆς ἀφύσσων χρυσέαις πέλλαις γάνος, which directly reflects the *At. Gl.* (cf. Lyc.'s reception of fr. 44). The Σ ad loc. (231.33 Scheer) explain πέλλη as ποιμενικὸν ποτήριον ἢ σκύφος and paraphrase χρυσοῖς ποτηρίοις. Thus Lyc. emulates Hes. *Theog.* 785 ἐν χρυσέῃ προχόῳ 'in a golden jug' of the relevant Hesiodic passage. Similarly, Cratin. ἐν Θρᾴτταις *PCG* 88 uses πελίκας rendered by Pollux 10.67 as κύλικας ἢ προχοΐδια, cf. Athen. 11.495a πελίκαι· Καλλίστρατος ἐν Ὑπομνήμασι Θρᾳττῶν Κρατίνου (*PCG* T. 39) ἀποδίδωσι κύλικα. Apollod. of Athens[12] *FGrH* 244 F 265 also clarified πέλικαν as ποτηρίου εἶδος, cf. also Hsch. π 1332 πέλικαν· εἶδος ποτηρίου ξυλίνου . . . ἄλλοι ξυλίνη λεκάνη, and Seleucus *apud* Athen. 11.495c explaining the Boeotian gloss πελίχνη as κύλικα.

---

[10] And in the form πελλίς in *IEG* 13.1, then with the same meaning Nic. *Alex.* 77. Athen. cites Phoen. *CA* 4.3 (Thales' prise) ἔλαβε πελλίδα χρυσῆν, 5.1–2 ἐκ πελλίδος . . ./. . . σπένδει, right after Hipponax *l.l.*, with the note ἐπὶ φιάλης τίθησι τὴν λέξιν. Cf. Hsch. π 1353 πελλὶς {ἢ πέλλας} (del. Schmidt: ἢ πέλλα{ς} Degani)· λεκάνη. *LSJ* s.v. relate πελίκη (Athen. 11.495a, Pollux 10.73), πέλυξ (Pollux 10.105), πελίχνα (Alcm. *PMGF* 19.4, Athen. 1.495c). See also the material gathered by K-A on Cratin. *PCG* 88.

[11] Coulon *frusta* attempted to establish it in Ar. *Lys.* 996 <τᾶν> πελλᾶν (: πελλάνας codd.) "nos vases à traire, c'est-à-dire nos femmes".

[12] In his Γλῶσσαι (*FGrH* 244 F 221)? "Vielleicht dienten auch sie . . der Homererklärung" *FGrH* ii.B, 796.

Σ Theoc. 1.23–6c (37.15 Wendel) τὰ δὲ ἀμόλγια πέλλας καλοῦσι παρὰ τὸ πίνειν ἐν αὐτοῖς seem to know of a usage of πέλλα as a drinking vessel. Guhl attributed this Σ to Theon (fr. *141).

Lexicographical sources commonly associate this or similar terms with Boeotia. Cf., other than P., Adesp. *PMG* 997.8, Athen. 11.495c Σέλευκος δὲ (deest ap. Müller) πελίχναν Βοιωτοὺς μὲν τὴν κύλικα, Εὐφρόνιος δὲ ἐν Ὑπομνήμασι (fr. 107 Strecker) τοὺς χόας, Pollux 10.73 ἔνιοι μέντοι τὸν χοῦν καὶ πελίκην κεκλῆσθαι νομίζουσι, καὶ εἶναι τοὔνομα Βοιώτιον, *id.* 10.78, Phot. *Lex.* 408.8 πέλικαν· Βοιωτοὶ τὴν ξυλίνην λεκάνην διὰ τὸ ἐκπεπελεκῆσθαι· Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ (*FGrH* 244 F 265) ποτηρίου εἶδος.

Fr. 34

Ion ἐν Ἐλεγείοις, a poet slightly older than P. who is praised by Call. (*Dieg. Iambi* fr. 203) for his πολυειδεία, *IEG* 27.2–3 κρητῆρ' οἰνοχόοι θέραπες/κιρνάντων προχύταισιν ἐν ἀργυρέοις is quoted by Athenaeus as having employed this term in the sense 'pitcher' as an alternative of πρόχοος. Alexander Com. *PCG* Dubia 4 [= Alex. Aet. *CA* Falsa 22] is also attested — right after P. — to have used the word. The Coan adds a meaning employed in a vulgar ambience, according to which προχύτης is a broad wooden vessel used by rustics for drinking, as fr. 29 ἄμφωξις. He may have drawn this vocable in his discussion of Homeric πρόχοος (1x *Il.*, 7x *Od.*, always 'ewer for pouring water upon the hands', but 'wine-jug' in *Od.* 18.297), cf. Σ *Od.* 1.136 (I.31 Dindorf) explaining προχόῳ as ἀγγείῳ προχυτικῷ, ἀπὸ τοῦ χέειν τὸ ὕδωρ. Simaristus, an undatable grammarian known only from Pamphilus > Athenaeus (Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 656 n. 58), in the fourth book of Περὶ συνωνύμων, which apparently dealt with drinking vessels, explained this as 'a kind of cup'. As in fr. 30, he may have taken account of P.'s interpretation. Hsch. π 4103 προχύτης· ποτήριόν τι seems to ultimately depend on him and the entry in its original form might have contained information on P.

Fr. 35

Hesychius preserves the correct form of this cultic object, along with the parallel form σκαλλόν. The word is a technical term related to σκάλλω 'hoe', an 'agricultural' verb (Hdt., Arist., Theophr., *Geop.*, Theoc. 10.14 ἄσκαλος). The collective Αἰολεῖς, instead of a specific region, is unparalleled in the extant fragments and, if accurate, it

may mean that P. knew of such a usage of this term in more than one Aeolic region. On Aeolic -λλ- < -λ*j*- see Schwyzer i, 323.

Fr. 36

The same cake appears in many forms, cf. Hsch. α 3750 ἀμόρα· σεμίδαλις ἑφθὴ σὺν μέλιτι, α 4178 ἄμωρος· πλακοῦντος εἶδος, ο 817 ὅμουρα· σεμίδαλις ἑφθή, μέλι ἔχουσα καὶ σήσαμον. Comparable are Hsch. α 3751 ἀμοργίτας [i.e. ἀμορϝίτας]· πλακοῦντας, ο 785 ὁμορίτας· ἄρτος ἐκ πυροῦ διηττημένου γεγονώς, cf. Septuag. *Paral.* i 16.3 ἄρτον ἕνα ἀρτοκοπικὸν καὶ ἀμορίτην, see Redard 88. Its constituents suggest a wedding cake, as fr. 37 κρηΐον. The term appears to be Sicilian, cf. Athen. 14.646f ἀμορβίτης πλακοῦντος εἶδος παρὰ Σικελοῖς (Gloss. Ital. *PCG* i, 324 no 188), and ὅμωρος in Epich. frr. 46, 113.241 and Sophron fr. 26. P. might have picked it up from a Sicilian comedy or mime (σεμίδαλις is an especially comic word, see K-A on Ar. fr. 428). Literature from the area would be a yielding source in this respect as the Σικελῶν τράπεζαι were notorious for their variety, cf. Plato *Rep.* 404d, *Epist.* 326b, Clearchus fr. 59 *ap.* Athen. 12.518c. μελιτώματα 'honey-cakes' seems to be the erudite version of P. It is a rare word occurring before him in *Batrach.* 39 χρηστὸν μελίτωμα, τὸ καὶ μάκαρες ποθέουσιν. μελιτώματα δ' ἐστὶν πεπεμμένα may have been added by Pamphilus to clarify P.'s rendering.

Fr. 37

Coans considered themselves as deriving their origin from the Argolid and it is an Argive custom that P. describes here. κρηΐον is a wedding-cake which is brought from the house of the bride to the house of the groom for the relatives (οἱ φίλοι) to taste. Its cooking on fire suggests an ancient custom. The fact that it is served with honey has a symbolic meaning, honey being a sign of welfare and prosperity. A similar habit is recorded from an anonymous comic poet (Adesp. *PCG* *537) in Phot. *Lex.* 510.7 <σησάμην>,[13] which might suggest a comic passage here as well (Middle comedy?).

---

[13] <σησάμην·> (add. M. Deufert, *Hermes* 128 (2000), 255) σήσαμον μετὰ μέλιτος κεκομμένον πρῶτον μὲν παρὰ τῷ νυμφίῳ (τοῦ νυμφίου Naber) τὸ παλαιὸν ἐδίδοσαν τοῖς ἀπαντῶσι περιιόντες τῶν ἐντίμων ἢ φίλων, ἐπιλέγοντες ὡς παρὰ τοῦ γαμοῦντός ἐστιν ἢ τῆς γαμουμένης. νῦν δὲ δεῖπνα ποιοῦντες κατ' οἰκίαν διανέμουσι τοῖς κεκλημένοις. ἔστι δὲ ὅτε τὴν σησάμην θέλοντες περιφέρειν δεῦρο πολυτελῆ (: δῶρα

κρῆϊον is commonly considered as an Ionic form, like the -ηϊον forms with which the Homeric language is rich (Chantraine 1933, 60f., Risch 127–8). It may be an Argive gloss adduced by P. in his discussion of the Homeric hapax *Il.* 9.206 κρεῖον 'meat-block (for chopping before roasting)'. This is normally rendered as κρεοδόχον ἀγγεῖον, see Erbse on Σ A ad loc. a[1] (II.442), but EtG (AB) κρεῖον (*apud* Erbse *l.l.*) report alternative interpretations: ἡ μὲν κοινὴ δόξα ἔχει ὅτι τὸ 'κρεῖον' κρεοδόχον ἀγγεῖον σημαίνει (A: ἐστὶν B), ὁ δὲ Εὐφορίων (*CA* 155) τὸ κρέας λέγει αὐτὸ εἶναι, ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος· 'αὐτὰρ ὁ γὲ κρεῖον μέγα κάββαλε' (*Il.* 9.206). ὁ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸς (II.538.3 Lentz) τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὠμῶν κρεάτων πεπληρωμένην τράπεζαν. ὁ δὲ Πτολέμαχος (fort. Πολέμαρχος Erbse: Πτολεμαῖος Lentz, Gaede) τὸν ἀπὸ στέατος πλακοῦντά φησιν αὐτὸ σημαίνειν. This Πτολέμαχος may be Polemarchus, the 1st cent. AD author of an onomasticon, who was used by Pamphilus and paid particular attention to cakes.[14] Here he seems to echo a form of P.'s contribution to the exegesis of this term. This does not enfeeble Kuchenmüller's proposal that the ultimate source of Athenaeus may be Iatrocles, the undated author of a Περὶ πλακούντων (and of an Ἀρτοποιητικόν) known only from Athenaeus. He seems to have been exhaustive about the cooking and serving of different cakes (Athen. 14.646b, 647b), and as Athen. 7.326e evidences, he was taken into account by Pamphilus (see Schoenemann 105).

Kaibel *frustra* emended κρῆϊον into κηρίον on the strength of Hsch. κ 2546 κηρίον· τὸ τῶν μελισσῶν. καὶ εἶδος πλακοῦντος. Hesychius also offers κ 4061 κρῆϊα· ζῴδια, interpreted by Schmidt as "placentas animalium formas repraesentantes" (cf. *LSJ* s.v.). *Id.* κ 4063 κρῆϊον· ἐπίκοπον. κρειοδόχον λέβητα reproduces the vulgate.

Fr. 38

With this statement Athen. concludes his treatment of κύπελλον 'drinking cup', a word which appears 5x in the *Il.* and 5x in the *Od.*, and enjoys regular revivals in later poetry, Ion Trag. *TrGF* 19 F 20, Antim. fr. 24.2, Q.S. 6.345. As Athen. reports, it was a technical

---

πολ. Alberti, lac. ind. Chr. Theodoridis, *ZPE* 26 (1977), 50) ἐν δὲ τοῖς γάμοις ἐδίδοσαν σησάμην, ἐπεὶ πολυγονώτατον σήσαμον.

[14] Cf. Athen. 3.111c, where Nicostr. *PCG* 13 is quoted. On Polemarchus see Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 653 n. 52, C. Wendel, *RE* XXI.1.1258–59 s.v. Polemarchos (3).

term in the dialects of Crete and Cyprus (see C. M. Bowra, *JHS* 54 (1934), 73), and a Macedonian usage in Marsyas *FGrH* 135–136 F 22 (Athen. 11.477a) called κύπελλον καὶ τὸ ξύλινον ποτήριον. In Athen. 11.482f κύπελλα is said to have been discussed by Silenus and Nic. (fr. 140) in the sense ἐκπώματα σκύφοις ὅμοια.

Separately from these, P. reports that in Syracuse κύπελλα is used of the crumbs of barley-cakes or (καί) wheat-bread left on the table after dinner. "Videtur esse quod vulgo σκύβαλα dicebant" Kaibel, *Com. Gr. Fr.* i, Berlin 1899, 201 (Gloss. Ital. 27 = *PCG* 29) *cl.* Hsch. α 6266 ἀποβράσματα· τὰ σκύβαλα τῶν πυρῶν. Significantly, σκύβαλον is often used from the 3rd cent. BC onwards of the remains of food, cf. Leon. Tar. *HE* 37.6 ἀποδειπνιδίου . . σκυβάλου, see G-P on Heges. *HE* 7.2. Subject-matter would suit comedy, cf. Ar. *Plut.* 594 with Σ, K-A on Ar. fr. 209, and the source may be comedy or mime from Syracuse, as is possibly the case with fr. 36.

Fr. 39

Athen. among ἄρτων ὀνόματα gathered by οἱ γλωσσογράφοι supplies this piece of information about σποδεύς. Literary provenance is suggested by the fact that this seems a choicier version of the vernacular-sounding σποδίτης (ἄρτος), a generic term for loaves named from the way they were baked, cf. Athen. 3.111d–e βάκχυλος δ' ἐστὶν ἄρτος σποδίτης etc. *cl.* Diphil. *PCG* 25 ἄρτους σποδίτας κρησερίτας περιφέρειν, also Hippocr. *Muliebr.* 2.118 and probably Pherecr. *PCG* 61 †ὤλεν ὀβελίαν σποδεῖν, ἄρτου δὲ μὴ προτιμᾶν. The baking of bread on fire was not uncommon in primitive societies or in the low social classes, cf. fr. 37, Athen. 3.110a ἐγκρυφίας, 3.110b ἐπανθρακίς (ἔοικε δὲ καὶ οὗτος ἐπ' ἀνθράκων γίνεσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ παρ' Ἀττικοῖς ἐγκρυφίας), 3.111e ἀποπυρίας (ἄρτου δ' εἶδός ἐστι . . . ἐπ' ἀνθράκων δ' ὀπτᾶται, see K-A on Cratin. *PCG* 106).[15] σποδεύς is here restricted to refer to the bread consumed by relatives in what might be part of a wedding ceremony (as in fr. 37 κρήϊον) corresponding to γαμήλια, a wedding banquet open only to the clansmen of the bride, Hsch. γ 118

---

[15] On this kind of loaves see Blümner i, 84, Koukoules v, 26. On σποδεύς see Redard 91 (*id.* 88f. on ending -ίτης for bakery products), J.-L. Perpillou, *Les substantifs grecs en -ευς*, Paris 1973, 295–6 (but the term would hardly refer the to loaf's colour).

γαμήλια· . . . καὶ δεῖπνον, ὃ τοῖς φράτορσιν ἐποίει ὁ γαμῶν, see further Jacoby on Phanodem. *FGrH* 325 F 17, W. Erdmann, *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland*, Munich 1934, 261f. *cl.* Hsch. ε 4259 ἐπαύλια. This may suggest Attica.

Fr. 40

Timachidas, a 2nd/1st cent. BC author of an influential *Glossai*, seems to have first excerpted P.'s interpretation of this term.[16] According to this, ἰάκχα is the name of an odorous garland in Sicyon. Hesychius' explanation is indebted to P., and the following entry ι 22 ἰακχάζει· φυλλολογεῖ may have once been part of the same discussion. The term is apparently related to Iacchus, a mystic denomination of Dionysus, who was a god broadly worshipped in Sicyon of the famous vineyards.[17] Dionysus is intimately related with wreaths (Blech 202f., 210f.) and fertile Sicyon was rich in flora (A. Griffin, *Sicyon*, Oxford 1982, 31). Pliny *NH* 21.4, 25.125 asserts that floral wreaths were invented by Glycera, a Sicyonian woman. Comparable is βάκχος explained by Σ vet. Ar. *Eq.* 408a (103.11 Mervyn Jones) as στεφάνης εἶδος, ὡς Νίκανδρος ἐν τῷ περὶ γλωσσῶν (fr. 130) ἱστορεῖ.

O. Kern, *RE* IX.1.613 s.v. Iakchai and *ibid.* 619 s.v. Iakchos, deduced from Athenaeus that garlands devoted to Dionysus were called ἰάκχαι in Sicyon. Griffin, *l.l.*, gathered the names of Sicyonian herbs such as παιδέρως (cf. Paus. 2.10.6) or ἕρπυλλος (cf. Theophr. *HP* 6.7.2) and from a piece of information in Athen. 14.622c, that the φαλλοφόροι enter the theatre and προσωπεῖον μὲν οὐ λαμβάνουσιν, προπόλιον (ACE: προσκόπιον Kaibel) δ' ἐξ ἑρπύλλου περιτιθέμενοι καὶ παιδέρωτος ἐπάνω τούτου ἐπιτίθενται στέφανον δασὺν ἴων καὶ κιττοῦ, he suggested that ἰάκχα may be the name of such a garland. Although P. in the present form of his lemma does not identify the particular flowers of which ἰάκχα consists, and Athen. does not specify

[16] For Timachidas' interest in garlands cf. fr. 25 Blinkenberg (Athen. 15.678c) on ἐπιθυμίς. He may have also taken P. into account regarding fr. 42 ἴσθμιον. To judge from Athen.'s frequent references to his *Glossai*, they must have exercised considerable influence, see K. Ziegler, *RE* VIA.1059.

[17] For the Sicyonian wine cf. Pind. *N.* 10.43, Athen. 1.33b, Pliny *NH* 14.74 and for the cult of Dionysus there cf. Paus. 2.7.5 (processions and rituals) and a dedicatory inscription in phalaecians *SEG* 39.1334 (*c.* 230–220 BC). See also *Inc. sed.* fr. 27.

Sicyon as the place of this practice or provides a name for such a garland, the names of the flowers are Sicyonian and this explanation seems a plausible possibility.

An Imperial *v.l.* εἰάκχα generated the Hesychian form θιάκχα, later placed *suo loco* by a Byzantine adaptor (Latte, *Hesychius* i, xxx). The geminate ἰάχχα of cod. A is a phonological simplification already attested in a 3rd cent. BC Attic inscription. Such phenomena multiply later, see Threatte i, 541, Schwyzer i, 316. On the anonymous couplet that P. probably quoted from a Sicyonian poet, see *All. Poet. Ascr.* 9.

Fr. 41

P. *dat similia.* In *Od.* 18.291f. each suitor sends out a herald to fetch a gift for Penelope. Antinous produces a πέπλον, Eurymachus an ὅρμον ('necklace'), Eurydamas ἕρματα ('ear-rings') and Pisander an ἴσθμιον (300). The latter, originally of anything 'pertaining to the neck', was commonly understood as περιτραχήλιον κόσμημα (Σ and Eustath. ad loc., Pollux 5.98, Apoll. Soph., Hsch., Suid., Orion Theb. > EtGud. = EtG = EtM s.v.) on the basis of ἰσθμός = τράχηλος, Σ, Eustath. ad loc., 1847.44 παρὰ δὲ τοῖς παλαιοῖς φέρεται, ὅτι καὶ μέρος τι σώματος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἴσθμιον, EtG (AB; *apud* Theodoridis, Phot. *Lex.* ι 209) ἴσθμιον· ὁ περιτραχήλιος κόσμος . . . ἰσθμὸς (B: ἰθμὸς A) δὲ καὶ ὁ τράχηλος. ἴσθμια (and παρίσθμια) '*fauces*' is an anatomic term in Hippocr. *Dent.* 21 and in Nic. *Alex.* 191, 615, and so is ἰσθμός in Nic. *Alex.* 80, 508 and then in Galen and Aretaeus Med. The Σ on *Od.* 18.300 (II.665 Dindorf) define the difference between ἴσθμιον and the previously mentioned ὅρμον as τὸ μὲν γὰρ προσέχεται τῷ τραχήλῳ, ὁ δὲ ὅρμος κεχάλασται, see E. Bielefeld, *AH* C, 5, G. Wickert-Micknat, *AH* R, 126 n. 765.

To support this interpretation P., lacking more positive evidence, adduced στέφανος as being able to denote both a part of the head and an ornament around it, i.e. a garland (κόσμος = στέφανος, see Blech 328). Conversely, ἴσθμιον can apply to both a part of the body 'neck' (Plato *Tim.* 69e, *v.l.* in Emped. 31 B 100.19 D-K) and to a piece of jewellery around it, 'necklace'. Moreover, P. adds that the curb-stone of a well or the guard? of a dagger can also be called by the same term. The latter sense is unattested, but the former is

known from several sources.[18] στέφανος is not known to have been employed as an anatomical term, but στεφάνη '*sutura coronalis*' is a medical term in Aretaeus Med. *CD* 1.2 and Pollux 2.39 καὶ μὴν καὶ στεφάνην καλοῦσι τὸ μέσον τοῦ ἰνίου τε καὶ βρέγματος ~ *id.* 2.40, as well as denoting from Homer onwards a "flat metal band worn above the forehead" of women or goddesses.[19] Homeric scholars early associated these two terms to explain the one occurrence of στέφανος in Homer, *Il.* 13.736 στέφανος πολέμοιο, cf. Σ A (Ariston.) ad loc. (III.537 Erbse, *q.v.*) στέφανος δὲ ὁ κύκλος, ἀπὸ τῆς στεφάνης τῶν γυναικῶν, Hsch. σ 1793, Ariston. in Σ A *Il.* 13.736b ἀλλ' ἴσως ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐμπλοκὴν στεφάνης διὰ τὸ κυκλοτερὲς εἴρηται ("indicare videtur esse fortasse στέφανος pro στεφάνη ut πύλος πύλη, alia (v. Scholl. E 397)" Lehrs in L. Friedländer, *Nicanoris Περὶ Ἰλιακῆς στιγμῆς reliquiae*, Berlin 1850, 225 (quoted in Erbse *l.c.*). Cf. also Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 726f.[20]

It may be from this parallelism that a circle of scholars such as Simias, Timachidas of Rhodes and Silenus ὁ γλωσσογράφος (2nd/1st cent. BC, see Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 659f.) were induced into the idea that ἴσθμιον, as ἰσθμιακόν in Ar. fr. 505, may actually mean 'wreath' (conceivably, of gold). The accusative in their texts may indicate direct relevance to the Homeric passage. This interpretation is then echoed in Hsch. ι 398 ἴθμιον· περιστόμιον, περιτραχήλιον. ἢ στεφανίς. According to Athenaeus the term was actually employed in this meaning by Callixenus (2nd cent. BC) in a passage now lost from his work Περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας. See Blech 391 n. 2.

---

[18] First in a 6th cent. BC Athenian inscription ἴσ[θ]μιον <φ>ρέατος (*LSJ Suppl.* s.v.) and this seems to be the sense in Eur. fr. 656 ἢ πεσοῦσ' ἀπ' ἰσθμίου (Nauck: ἰσφνίου cod.)/κευθμῶνα πηγαῖον ὕδωρ (not 'neck of a jar' as in *LSJ* s.v. ἴσφνιον), possibly of someone pondering various ways of commiting suicide. Then Moeris ι 7 ἴσθμιον Ἀττικοί. περιστόμιον ἢ φρεάτιον Ἕλληνες, Hsch. ι 398 (quoted ff.), *id.* ι 929 ἴσθμιον· . . . περιστόμιον, Phot. *Lex.* ι 208 ἴσθμιον· τὸ τοῦ φρέατος περιστόμιον, Suid. ι 638, see Hansen on Moeris *l.c.*

[19] See West on Hes. *Theog.* 578, Erbse on Σ T *Il.* 18.597 (IV.567). On the semantic range of στέφανος/στεφάνη see Blech 33f.

[20] The postHomeric usage of the word στέφανος itself, some argued, was inappropriate to explain the Homeric term, because Homer did not know the practice of crowning victors with a στέφανος, see Schmidt 216–7, Dyck on Comanus fr. 12 (Apoll. Soph. 144.29) with 247 n. 36 on the frequency of such κατὰ μεταφοράν explanations in the D-Σ.

Fr. 42

Athen. 15.674c says that ἐκάλουν δὲ καὶ οἷς περιεδέοντο τὸν τράχηλον στεφάνους ὑποθυμίδας (see Blech 71–2) and goes on to quote Alc. fr. 362, Sappho fr. 94.15–6 and Anacr. *PMG* 397, cf. Hsch. υ 642 ὑποθυμίς· στέφανος ὑποτραχήλιος. A few chapters later this passage serves as an introductory note to P.'s discussion of ὑποθυμίς. According to the Coan the Lesbians specifically call ὑποθυμίδα (singular!) a branch of myrtle around which violets and other flowers are weaved into a wreath (ὑποθυμίδες). For such a restriction in meaning cf. fr. 43. P. may have adduced passages of Lesbian authors to found his explanation, but the abbreviator omits those with a quick reference to the discussion of the same term in a previous chapter. The Coan's sources may not have been identical to the ones in Athen., since even if his περὶ ὃν πλέκειν etc. could be deduced from πλεκταί, the standard attribute of ὑποθυμίδες, the information about μυρσίνης κλῶνα would have to rely on a different source. Besides, none of these fragments seems to relate myrtle or violets.

Both plants singled out by P., myrtle (Lembach 125f.) and violets (Lembach 158f.), produce a strong aroma and are common constituents of festive garlands. The myrtle was sacred to Aphrodite (Blech 250–1) and P.'s source(s) may have treated it as an erotic plant. Plut. *Quaest. conv.* 647f (ὑποθυμίδας) διὰ τὴν ἀποφορὰν καὶ ὑποθυμίασιν and Athen. 15.688c ὑποθυμίδας . . . ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀνθῶν ἀναθυμιάσεως derive the etymon of this word from its strong fragrance. There were wreaths consisting only of myrtle-branches, usually of religious character (Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 43), but more gratifying types of wreaths, such as the one that P. has in mind, were intertwined with other flowers and this may be the distinction envisaged in Eubul. *PCG* 104.1–2 πότερ' ἑρπυλλίνους/ἢ μυρτίνους ἢ τῶν †διηνθημένων†; see N-H on Hor. *C.* 1.38.5 *simplici myrto.*

Fr. 43

Apollodorus of Athens rendered ἕλινος straight as ἄμπελος, but P. had specified its meaning as τὸν κλάδον τῆς ἀμπέλου. As with the specification of ὑποθυμίς in the previous fragment, P.'s comment may rely on literary evidence. It would originally be placed in a Σ on Nic. *Alex.* 181 ἐκ ψιθίης ἑλίνοιο, whence it would be placed in the Etymologica. Theon and Pamphilus wrote commentaries on Nic. (Gow-Scholfield 16 n. 2). Reitzenstein 1897, 210 noted that the EtG

preserves Nicander-Σ very different in form from those of the MSS, cf. also A. Colonna, "Antica esegesi Nicandrea negli Etymologica", *BollClass* n.s. 4 (1956), 17–24.

ἕλινος occurs as 'vine', except from Nic., in [Opp.] *Cyn.* 2.642, Nonn. *D.* 12.299 (in a passage replete with Hellenistic reminiscences; cf. ἑλινοφόρος in *D.* 16.278, 17.333 as *v.l.*), Dion. Per. 1157 πολυγνάμπτης ἑλίνοιο, where Eustath. (II.404 Müller) noted τῆς ἑλίνου ἤτοι τῆς ἀμπέλου, Herodian II.505.35 Lentz ἑλινός· ἡ ἄμπελος, ἑλινότροπος in *Hymn Is.* 18 (*IG* XII.5 739.18), always in connection with a vine or Dionysus. Suid. (lex. Ambr.) ε 859 gives ἕλινος· καρπός. The breathing, accentuation and gender of this word vary in the paradosis. Its etymon (Frisk s.v. compares ἕλιξ, ἕλμις, ἑλένη etc.) shows that the aspirated form is preferable. Its gender might have originally been masculine, but the feminine prevailed (Nic., [Opp.], etc.) — by analogy to ἄμπελος? In general, see Chantraine *DE* s.v., Vian on Nonn. *D.* 12.299.

A notable feature of this fragment is the specification of ἕλινος not as ἄμπελος, but as the branch of it. Compare EtG (AB) α 1125 αὐρόσχας· ἡ ἄμπελος· μέμνηται Παρθένιος (*SH* 633)... Ἐρατοσθένης δὲ (*CA* 28)... τὸ κατὰ βότρυν κλῆμα (Ἐρατ. — κλῆμα om. B) and note Σ Theoc. 7.134b (110.7 Wendel) on the absolute hapax οἰναρέοισι: κυρίως τὰ φύλλα τῆς ἀμπέλου, probably as distinguished from the grapes themselves.[21]

Fr. 44

ὄμπνιος is a rare word first appearing in an Attic ambience. It is derived from ὄμπ(ν)η which is glossed by Hsch. ο 826 as τροφή, εὐδαιμονία, cf. also Σ Nic. *Alex.* 7b (p. 31 Geymonat) τῆς ὄμπης.., ἥ ἐστι τροφή, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ Ὄμπνια, Hsch. ο 825 ὄμπια· παντοδαπὰ τρωγάλια. As noted by G. W. Wentzel *apud* Adler, *Suidae lex.* at ο 304, the present lexicographic entries of this term go back to the Atticists, see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 357. P. is said to have commented on the phrase ὄμπνιον στάχυν, which he probably read in

[21] Cf. Phaenias fr. 50 with Wehrli ad loc. Φανίας δέ φησιν οἰναρίζειν τὸ περιαιρεῖν τῶν οἰναρέων καὶ τρυγᾶν, Σ vet. Ar. *Pax* 1147b (p. 164 Holwerda) οἰναρίζειν: τὸ ἀποφυλλίζειν· οἴναρα γὰρ τὰ φύλλα τῆς ἀμπέλου. τινὲς δὲ γράφουσιν ἀμπελουργεῖν, οὐκ ὀρθῶς, *ibid.* c, Σ Nic. *Alex.* 55e (p. 49 Geymonat) θρίων· θρία δὲ ἰδίως μὲν τὰ φύλλα τῆς συκῆς, ὥσπερ οἴναρα τὰ τῆς ἀμπέλου, Hsch. ο 312 οἴναρα· τὰ τῆς ἀμπέλου φύλλα, *id.* τ 1746.

an unknown tragedy (see K. Spanoudakis, *RhM* n.s. 143 (2000), 112). This brings ὄμπνιος close to Demeter to whom P. seems to be the first to apply ὄμπνιος (fr. 5a).

Hsch. ο 828 shows that ὄμπνιος was interpreted in many different ways, ὄμπνια (Call. fr. 1.10)· καρποφόρος. [τροφή.] ἄφθονος. ἀγαθή. νόστιμος. ἢ τὸ ἀναπνεῖν ἡμῖν δίδουσα. Such information may have once stood in Theon's Σ on Call. fr. 1.10. P., in his interpretation of the anonymous fragment, rendered ὄμπνιον not as πολύν, δαψιλῆ, as held by the vulgate, but, apparently influenced by his physiological readings, as εὔχυλον καὶ τρόφιμον. τρόφιμον 'nourishing' comes up in lexicographic entries illustrating Call. *Hec.* fr. 144, such as Hsch. ο 833 ὀμπνηρὸν ὕδωρ· τρόφιμον, Suid. ο 304, Phot. *Lex.* 342.15. P. took up εὔχυλον 'succulent, savoury' from Theophrastus,[22] but this term was left aside by later compilators, although νόστιμος in Hsch. *l.c.* may be a more lucid equivalent of P.'s learned term. For the medical sense of the word cf. Suid. ε 3833 εὐχυλότερος· ὁ ταχέως πεττόμενος. P.'s comment on ὄμπνιον στάχυν would conceivably be part of a comprehensive discussion about the possible meanings of the vocable ὄμπνιος.[23]

The entry had an impact on later poetry. Lyc. 621 Δηοῦς . . . ὄμπνιον στάχυν took up the expression (see A. Rengakos, *ZPE* 104 (1994), 124), which also crept into hexameters in the inverse order, A.R. 4.989 = Nonn. *D.* 47.50, cf. also Erat. *CA* 16.17 ὄμπνιον . . καρπὸν . . Δημήτερος.

Fr. 45

Demeter Ἀχαία was commonly understood as 'suffering ἄχη', cf. Nic. *Ther.* 484–5, Hsch. α 8806 and see Richardson on *HHD* 40, V. Suys, *AC* 63 (1994), 1f. In the ancient lexica the *locus classicus* to illustrate this was Ar. *Ach.* 709 where the Σ offered various interpretations, cf.

---

[22] In Theophr. 20x + 5x εὐχυλία. Otherwise this is a rare, prosaic word. In Leon. Tar. *HE* 56.1 †φιλευχείλῳ† τε Λαφυγμῷ Hecker proposed φιλευχύλῳ 'fond of dainties', perhaps correctly.

[23] The sense of ὄμπνιον attested as Cyrenean (τὸν πλούσιον καὶ εὐδαίμονα, missing in Hsch. ο 828) may have been advanced in the 3rd cent. BC. Lyc. 1264 κτῆσιν ἄλλην ὀμπνίαν κειμηλίων takes account of it besides 621 which glances at the *At. Gl.*, cf. also Archim. Syr.? *SH* 201.44 ταύτῃ γ' ὄμπνιος ἐν σοφίῃ. On the widespread association of ὄμπνιος with ἀναπνεῖν see van der Valk on Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1012.4 (III.719) and cf. [Theoc.] 25.263.

Orion Theb. 18.22 Ἀχαία = Σ Ar. *Ach.* 708c (94.2 Wilson), see Theodoridis on Phot. *Lex.* α 3419. In the Parisine MS of Orion (known as Orion Koesii) this Σ follows as a separate entry (καὶ πάλιν Ἀχαιά, ἡ Δημήτηρ etc.) right after an entry where an uninformative note on P.'s interpretation ἐρίθους = ἀχαιάς is embedded amidst information about Demeter.

P.'s lemma may in reality be ἔριθοι, not ἀχαιαί, so that this may be another entry on a Homeric rarity (note the wording in Orion). These are male harvesters in *Il.* 18.550, 560, but female servants already in Hes. *WD* 602f. As the main duty of the latter was wool-working, a paretymological connection with ἔριον was facilitated, so that ἔριθοι ended up meaning 'wool-workers'.[24] A trace of P.'s interpretation seems to survive in Hsch. α 8806 Ἀχαία· . . . οἱ δὲ ἔρια μαλακά, which cod. p, interpolated from Hesychius, placed in a separate lemma αχεῖα· ἔρια, cf. *id.* α 8877. Then in a 6th cent. AD marriage contract containing many novel forms, ἀπὸ ἀχάης 'from (fine) wool' appears, POxy. 1978.3, *al.*, and in PHarris 88.21 (5th cent. AD). It would appear that there was an obsolete word ἀχάη = ἔριον, whence P. drew the parallelism ἀχαιαί = ἔριθοι, which would be very much like his interpretative methods, cf. fr. 41 ἴσθμιον ~ στέφανος.

Fr. 46

P.'s inquiry of ἄμαλλαι would be part of his discussion of the Homeric gloss ἀμαλλοδετήρ, *Il.* 18.553–4 (δράγματα) ἀμαλλοδετῆρες ἐν ἐλλεδανοῖσι δέοντο./τρεῖς δ' ἄρ ἀμαλλοδετῆρες ἐφέστασαν, cf. Hesychius' καὶ Ὅμηρος χρῆται τῇ λέξει. This is glossed by Σ bT (ex.) 18.553a (IV.552 Erbse) as οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαλλῶν δεσμὰ ποιοῦντες. EtG *l.c.* ἄμαλλα δὲ ἡ ἐκ πολλῶν δραγμάτων συναγωγή may be a simplified trace of a discussion containing more details about the number of handfuls comprising an ἄμαλλα. This trace is placed in the Homeric entry ἀμαλλοδετῆρες. If Methodius is the source of this lemma, as Reitzenstein

---

[24] Cf. *in primis* PHib. 121.34 (250 BC) ἐρίθοις ἐρίων, Erinna *SH* 401.23, *q.v.*, Theoc. 15.80 with Gow ad loc., Erat. *CA* 10.1, Σ A *Il.* 18.550d (IV.552 Erbse) ἔριθοι δὲ κυρίως οἱ ἐριουργοί, then φιλέριθος 'friend of wool workers' in Theoc. 28.1, Philip *GPh* 22.7. See also Edwards on *Il.* 18.550–1. Both meanings of the word ('harvesters', 'wool-workers') were in parallel use, see van der Valk on Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1163.20 (IV.251).

1897, 13.8 n. suggested, he and Diogenianus > Hesychius are likely to draw this piece of information from a Σ on Theoc. 10.44.[25]

ἄμαλλαι was a much discussed gloss. Semus Del. ἐν τῷ Περὶ παιάνων *FGrH* 396 F 23 specified that τὰ δράγματα τῶν κριθῶν αὐτὰ καθ' αὑτὰ προσηγόρευον ἀμάλας and ἄμαλλαι is rendered by Aelius Dion. α 91 Erbse (Phot. *Lex.* α 1110) as αἱ ἐκ τῶν δραγμάτων ἀγκαλίδες . . . ἀμάλλας γὰρ τὰ δράγματα ἐκάλουν, cf. Hsch. (Cyr.) α 3402, EtM α 1008 (< *EtG) ἄμαλλαι· τὰ δράγματα {τὰ} τοῦ σίτου, Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1162.23 (IV.252 van der Valk) ἄμαλλαι δὲ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς δράγματα σίτου, see Erbse on Σ *Il. l.c.*, Theodoridis on Phot. *Lex. l.c.*

The Coan apparently discussed this term in detail; he specified that an ἄμαλλα consists of two hundred δράγματα. Istrus ὁ Καλλιμάχειος took issue with this contending that an ἄμαλλα consists of only one hundred δράγματα. Hesychius' ἀγκάλη (cf. *Il.* 18.555 παῖδες δραγμεύοντες, ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσσι φέροντες) would be a trace of his argumentation for a reduced number. δράγματα 'handfuls (of stalks of corn)' is an essential part of any interpretation of ἄμαλλα. It occurs in the same breath as ἀμαλλοδετῆρες in *Il.* 18.552 (in Homer once more in *Il.* 11.69), cf. Theoc. 10.44 σφίγγετ', ἀμαλλοδέται, τὰ δράγματα, EtM α 1000 ἀμαλλεύειν· δραγμεύειν (*Il.* 18.555).

ἄμαλλαι comes up first in Soph. *Triptolemus* fr. 607 (adduced by P.? Cf. fr. 44),[26] then employment by Call. fr. 186.27, who would be aware of P.'s discussion (Rengakos 1992, 28), gave the word an impetus, cf., in different forms, Q.S. (3x ἄμαλλα, 2x ἀμαλλοδετῆρες), Pampr. 3.158, Dion. Per. 358, see Massimilla ad loc. The papyrus (POxy. 2214; saec. a.C. I *ex.*) there has the aspirated form ἁμ-, the existence of which is confirmed by *IG* I^3 425.10 (Athens, 5th cent. BC) *h*αμαλλεῖον. This was attributed by later etymologists to an alleged derivation from ἅμα ἀολλίζεσθαι χερσὶ τοὺς στάχυας (*EtG > EtM α 1008, Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1162.28 (IV.252 van der Valk, *q.v.*), where αμάλλαι bears both spirits). An annotation in EtM *apud* Reitzenstein 1897, 226.25 (app.) comments ἄμαλλα· εἰ μὲν παρὰ τὸ ἅμα δασύνεται. The form ἀμάλη is known from Semus Del. *l.c.*, Hsch. α 3402, Frust.

[25] Theon, a note of whose commentary on Call. *Aet.* is mentioned side by side with Methodius in EtG α 1198 ἁρμοῖ, would then be the most likely intermediator of that Σ, see, in general, Wendel 1920, 44f., *id.*, *RE* XV.2.1381.

[26] Wil. conjectured ἀμαλλοφόρος in Ar. fr. 767 = Phot. *Lex.* α 1203 for ἀμιλλοφόρος (b, z), but this is unlikely, see K-A ad loc.

Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1074 (Hsch. δ 700) δεσμεῖν ἀμάλας (: -λλας Cyr.), [Opp.] *Cyn.* 1.552 ἀμαλητόμος, Philostr. Jun. *Imag.* 10.13, Σ Theoc. 10.44a, *ibid.* c, Tzetzes Σ Lyc. 34 (29.27 Scheer), cf. Hsch. α 3408 ἀμαλη· ἁπαλή, νέα, εἰ ὀξύνοιτο (*Il.* 22.310) ἢ δράγματα, παροξυνόμενον.

Fr. 47

The dactylic genitive speaks for a literary source, but the juxtaposition with Amerias shows that P. discussed this term in the *At. Gl.* Amerias attests the Macedonian form of this gloss, cf. Hsch. β 355 βαυβυκᾶνες (Guiet: βανβ- H, ut in β 353–4)· πελεκᾶνες and see Hoffmann 13–4. Originally, βαῖβυξ may have been an attribute of the πελεκάν, as e.g. *Il.* 5.778, *al.* τρήρωσι πελειάσιν, 5.783, *al.* συσὶ κάπροισιν, 22.310 πτῶκα λαγωόν, *Od.* 13.86–7 ἴρηξ/κίρκος etc., perhaps related to the pelican's most notable feature, its 'pouch', cf. similarly Ar. fr. 591.64 [ὥ]σπερ πελεκᾶς πλατυγίζων 'walking with flat feet'. According to Chantraine *DE* s.v. the word lacks an etymology, but the redublication of β- and the suffix -υκ- are typical in appellations of birds, as ἶβυξ, ὄρτυξ or καταῖτυξ, see *id. FN*, 397–8, F. Skoda, *Le redoublement expressif*, Paris 1982, 211. M. Grošelj, *ŽAnt* 6 (1956), 53 approached Latin *bucca* 'stuffed cheek', on whose idea Windekens s.v. postulated *βαι(ο)υβυκ (cf. ὕβος 'hump') in the sense 'bladder to feed the little ones'.

The pelican could be seen in Northern Greece and in the wetlands of Attica, see Thompson 1936, 231, Dunbar on Ar. *Av.* 882 πελεκᾶντι, 883 πελεκίνῳ.

Fr. 48

In the celebrated passage about Odysseus' dog Argos, the poet says that young men were once driving him αἶγας ἐπ' ἀγροτέρας ἠδὲ πρόκας ἠδὲ λαγωούς, *Od.* 17.295, where the Σ interpret πρόκας as εἶδος ἐλάφου ταχυτάτης, ἀπὸ τοῦ προικνεῖσθαι B. δορκάδων εἶδος ἢ ἐλάφων QV. ἢ τὰ ἔκγονα τῶν ἐλάφων V. Dionysius of Chalcis identified πρόξ with ἔλαφος and Aristotle juxtaposed the two terms as denoting separate but related species, *HA* 506a22, 515b34, *PA* 676b27 ἔλαφος καὶ πρόξ. Cf. also Cyrill. *Lex.* cod. z (saec. X/XI; ed. M. Naoumides, *GRBS* 9 (1968), 286) πορκάς· ἔλαφος. ὑπὸ Ἀρκάδων τὸ ταχύ, Hsch. π 3039 πόρκας· ἐλάφους, π 3188 †πράκες·... ἔλαφοι, π 3524 πρόκας· ἐλάφους, Apoll. Soph. 135.19 πρόκας· οἱ μὲν ἐλάφους, οἱ δὲ ἕτερόν τι ζῴου εἶδος ὅμοιον λαγωῷ ὃ καλεῖται δορκάς.

Keeping to this line (πρόξ = ἔλαφος), P. advanced an arbitrary etymology πρόκας.. ἐλάφους τὰς πρώτως τικτομένας, οἷον πρωτοτόκους. Equally unfortunate were the other two etymologies known to the ancient sources, namely from προικνεῖσθαι in Σ B *Od. l.c.*, cf. Cyrill. *Lex. l.c.*, Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1821.23 παρὰ τὸ προκίειν, ἢ παρὰ τὸ προΐξεσθαι... ταχεῖα γάρ, or ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλα κέρατα ἔχειν.., οἷον προκέρας, ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸ τῆς ἡλικίας κέρας φύειν in Apion's Ὁμηρικαὶ γλῶσσαι fr. 113 Neitzel *apud* Apoll. Soph. *l.c.* πρόξ is an unidentified kind of deer, which derives its name from περκνός 'with dark spots', therefore 'dappled', cf. Hsch. π 3229 πρεκνόν· ποικιλόχροον ἔλαφον ("tragoedia" Schmidt ad loc.), see Chantraine *DE* s.v. περκνός, Orth, *RE* VIII.2.1942 s.v. Hirsch.

The word after *Od. l.c.* appears as προκάς in *HHAphr.* 71 and is said to have been employed instead of ἔλαφος by Archil. *IEG* 280 (Aristoph. Byz. fr. 186) in the sense 'coward'. It does not come up again until Arist.'s zoological works (3x), but finds new life in the erudite poets: A.R. 2.279 (hunting κύνες) ἢ αἶγας κεραοὺς ἠὲ πρόκας ἰχνεύοντες, Call. *HyArt.* 154 (~ 155) πρόκας ἠδὲ λαγωούς with Σ Ψ 154b (II.63 Pf.) <πρόκας·> νεβρούς and vv. 95f., *id. HyPal.* 91–2 δόρκας../καὶ πρόκας, Nic. *Ther.* 577–8 λαγωοῦ/ἢ προκὸς ἠὲ νεβροῖο [586 ἠὲ καὶ ἐξ ἐλάφοιο, which Gow transposed after 578] with Σ 578a (220.8 Crugnola) προκός· τοῦ τέκνου τῆς δορκάδος, *Alex.* 324.[27]

πρωτοτόκος = ἡ πρώτως τεκοῦσα seems to reflect P.'s learned vocabulary. The word is a Homeric hapax, *Il.* 17.5 (heifer) πρωτοτόκος.. οὐ πρὶν εἰδυῖα τόκοιο, cf. Arist. *HA* 546a12, *al.*, Theoc. 5.27 (goat) and see Erbse on Σ A *Il.* 17.5a (IV.330), p. 284 n. 124.

Fr. 49

Aristarchus is said to have abridged *Il.* 23.332–3 into ἢ τό γε σκῖρος ἔην· νῦν αὖ θέτο τέρματ' Ἀχιλλεύς where Σ T (ex. (Did.?), V.422 Erbse) explain σκῖρον δὲ τὴν ῥίζαν διὰ τὸ ἐσκιάσθαι. This seems to be a disconcerted Σ relying on Aristarch.'s interpretation. Valk ii,

[27] In A.R. Homeric imitation is apparent. Campbell 1981, 28 adduced *Il.* 3.24 ~ 15.271–2 ἢ ἔλαφον κεραὸν ἢ ἄγριον αἶγα/ἐσσεύοντο κύνες. In A.R. and Call. the term is conceived as an alternative to ἔλαφος. In Call. and Nic. the notion of smallness is obvious, cf. ζῷον μικρὸν in EtG. On poetic πρόξ see *in primis* Gow-Scholfield on Nic. *Ther.* 578, Bulloch on Call. *HyPal.* 91–2, Rengakos 1992, 28, *id.* 1994, 133–4.

151 suggested that Aristarch. conjectured this reading, but the fact that he and P. read the same text would favour the possibility that Aristarch. offers the authentic text.[28] If Hesychius' ἄλσος καὶ δρυμός reflects Aristarch., as Σ *l.c.* may suggest,[29] the reference to P. would go along with it. However, P. interprets σκῖρος differently: τὴν ῥυπώδη γῆν.[30] σκῖρος can denote 'filth' in comedy, cf. EtM 717.57 σκιρωθῆναί φαμεν ἐπὶ τοῦ ῥύπου τοῦ σφόδρα ἐμμένοντος καὶ δυσεκπλύτου . . . σκῖρον (σκίρων D: σκίρον cett.) δὲ τὸν ἀειδῆ (codd.: ἀηδῆ Meineke) ῥύπον καὶ Κρατῖνος λέγει (*PCG* 491), καὶ Εὔπολις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ τυρῷ ῥύπου (*PCG* 299).[31] P. might have adduced this usage to document his rendering, as the similarities of the entry in EtM with the first part of Hesychius' lemma suggest. The difference in opinion between P. and Aristarch. makes one think of Aristarch.'s Πρὸς Φιλίταν. For possible material from this monograph in Hsch. cf. fr. 51 ὑπ' αὐνήν†.

But the reference to P., albeit originally on a Homeric question, seems to have survived in studies on comic language. Cratinus and Eupolis are among Erat.'s favourite poets in his work on comedy, whence (cf. fr. 32) this piece of information could migrate to Didymus' studies on comic language, which were among Diogenianus' primary sources *pace* Hesychius' letter to Eulogius (1.4 Latte). In *Tabulae Heracleenses* 62.19, *al.* Schwyzer (4th cent. BC) σκίρω . . . ἀρρήκτω the term means 'hard land overgrown with bushes' (*LSJ* s.v. I.1) as opposed to δρυμός, cf. also Hsch. σ 884 σκ{ε}ῖρα· . . . χωρία ὕλην ἔχοντα εὐθετοῦσαν εἰς φρύγανα, further *id.* (Cyr.) α 6628 ἀποσκιρωθέν· ἀποσκληρανθέν, σ 892 σκ{ε}ιρόν· . . . σκληρόν ~ σ 895. Von Blumenthal 2169 suggested that this may be a vocable from Doric Heraclea, a Tarentine colony founded in 433 BC, or Taras, and it may be so, although it was perhaps mediated to P. through Attic comedy.

---

[28] For this view Valk ii, 152 n. 310 mentions C. Robert, *Hermes* 20 (1885), 351 and G. M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*, Oxford 1925, 201f.

[29] Hsch. ε 2060 ἐλίασεν· ἐτίναξεν may treat another Aristarchan *v.l.* in *Il.* 23.879 (a wounded dove) σὺν δὲ πτερὰ πυκνὰ λίασθεν (: λίασ(σ)εν Aristarch.). *Id.* δ 205 δάμνια· θύματα, σφάγια treats a *v.l.* ascribed to Zenod. *Glossai* fr. 1 Pusch.

[30] ῥυπώδη is Meineke's (first *apud* Bach 272) correction for the cod.'s πυρρώδη. Stephanus preferred πυρώδη, C. Robert, *Hermes* 20 (1885), 352 n. 2 proposed σκιρώδη, Kuchenmüller 106 even considered τυρώδη "terram caseo similem".

[31] The last is *optime* explained by Jacoby (*FGrH* IIIb ii, 201) as "the grey-white mould which spreads over the rind when the cheese is kept for some time" *cl.* Hsch. *l.c.* ὁ δριμὺς τυρός.

Fr. 50

Arist. *HA* 572b24f. explains that σκυζᾶν 'be in heat' is the *vox propria* to describe the sexual ardour experienced by female dogs in their time for copulation: αἱ ὕες δ' ὅταν ἔχωσι πρὸς τὴν ὀχείαν ὁρμητικῶς, ὃ καλεῖται καπρᾶν, ὠθοῦνται καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. περὶ δὲ τὰς κύνας τὸ τοιοῦτον πάθος καλεῖται σκυζᾶν, cf. also 574b2 (dogs), 572a30 (mares). The term is associated with dogs in Hsch. σ 1150 σκύζουσιν· ἡσυχῇ ὑποφθέγγονται, ὥσπερ κύνες and Pollux 5.86 (of dogs, in a chapter φωναὶ ζῴων) σκύζειν (L. Dindorf, *ThGL* viii, 451: σκυζᾶν cod.) δὲ τὸ καθεύδοντας ὑποφθέγγεσθαι and some felt that such a paretymological connection existed already in *Il.* 8.482–3 οὐ σευ ἔγωγε/σκυζομένης ἀλέγω, ἐπεὶ οὐ σέο κύντερον ἄλλο where Zeus rebukes Hera (κυνῶπις in *Il.* 18.396), cf. Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 723.43 (II.618 van der Valk) γίνεται δὲ ἴσως μὲν καὶ παρὰ τὸ κύων πλεονασμῷ τοῦ σ, ἵνα ᾖ σκύζεσθαι τὸ κύνεόν τινα σχεῖν ἦθος ἢ κυνῶπα εἶναι [. . .] ἔνθα καὶ δοκεῖ συγκροτεῖν εἰς τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ κυνὸς εἶναι τὸ σκύζεσθαι. εἰπὼν γὰρ 'οὐ σκυζομένης ἀλέγω', ἐπιφέρει εὐθὺς ὡς οἷον ἐτυμολογικῶς τὸ 'ἐπεὶ οὐ σέο κύντερον ἄλλο' ("Eust. ipse, opinor" van der Valk ad loc.), [Theoc.] 25.245 of a lion.[32] It seems that the question arose from P.'s treatment of the Homeric verb σκύζομαι (6x *Il.*, 1x *Od.*, mostly of the gods) and, most likely, from an interpretation of the Iliadic passage quoted above.

The substantive occurs only here and in a *defixio* of the 2nd cent. AD from Messene (Sicily) *SEG* 4.47, which speaks for a humble provenance. Hesychius seems to preserve a *verbatim* citation from *At. Gl.*: τῆς κάπρας may well be the erudite rendering of P., which Hsch. clarifies in a separate lemma, κ 738 κάπρας· ἀκολασίας.[33] It is suitable as another zoological metaphor with equivalent meaning. The coupling with σκύζη was no doubt suggested by their approximation in Arist. *l.c.* The iambic fragment quoted in P.'s discussion of this term seems to derive from an unknown comedy, see *All. Poet. Ascr.* 6.

---

[32] Modern etymologists hold σκύζομαι as onomatopoeic and Perpillou 12 approached σκύλαξ (or κύων) and compared γρύζω, ῥύζω and μύζω, see further E. Tichy, *Onomatopoetische Verbalbildungen des Griechischen*, Vienna 1983, 113. For σκύζομαι/σκύζα cf. κνύζομαι/κνύζα (Perpillou 47).

[33] Latte prints †κάπρας with "ft. καπρείας" in apparatus. "La correction . . . n'a pas lieu d'être" Ch. de Lamberterie, *REG* 107 (1994), 21 n. 14. For the formation cf. λέπρα > λεπρᾶν (Schwyzer i, 731).

Fr. 51

This is the only existing entry of *At. Gl.* in which P. appears to cite from an author of prose. M. Schmidt despaired with it ("glossam non expedio") and all attempts to sanate the corruption are hampered by the loss of the explanation. Jacoby on Hecataeus *l.c.* pondered an emendation of the Coan's name into φιλήτης, a synonymous gloss of which would lurk in the corrupt lemma. *LSJ* s.v. αὐνή considered establishing Ἄχνην for αὐνήν with reference to fr. 28. Likelier seems the course of corruption proposed by Kuchenmüller 107, who saw this entry as a detached resumption of υ 260 ὑπ' αὐλήν· ὑπ' οἶκον and tentatively fused them into ὑπ' αὐλήν· ὑπ' οἶκον, παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ, Φιλήτας.

If this entry is related to υ 260, the question involved is Homeric as some interpreted αὐλή as οἶκος and others, such as Aristarchus, as ὑπαίθριος τόπος.[34] P. apparently opined that Homeric αὐλή can denote a covered space in a residence. Such a misunderstanding would be facilitated by the formula *Il.* 9.472, *al.* ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ εὐερκέος αὐλῆς/ (F-G on *Od.* 21.389), where Aristarch. eliminated ὑπ' for ἐν. Hecataeus could have used this word (12x in Hdt., 'house' in 5.92γ.2) and P. may have adduced him to support his view. Ionian logographers, as shown by Hdt., had a lively interest in dialect and foreign glosses (see Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 649f.) and P. would naturally take their works into account. Hecataeus in particular was often dragged into Homeric exegesis, but, as a matter of principle, he was disregarded by Aristarchus, cf. Σ T (ex.) *Il.* 24.228b[1] (V.559 Erbse) {καὶ} φωριαμῶν: . . . Ἀρίσταρχος δέ φησι τὴν κιβωτὸν λέξιν νεωτέρων εἶναι· ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὅτι Σιμωνίδης (*PMG* 623) καὶ Ἑκαταῖος (*FGrH* 1 F 368) μέμνηται αὐτῆς.[35] The question may have been dealt with in Πρὸς Φιλίταν, then perhaps mediated to Diogenianus from Didymus.

---

[34] Aristarchus read in *Od.* 4.74 Ζηνός που τοιήδε γ' Ὀλυμπίου ἔνδοθεν αὐλή and deemed that Homer τὴν αὐλὴν ἀεὶ τάττει ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπαίθρων τόπων, Athen. 5.189e, see Ludwich i, 538 and cf. Σ b *Il.* 6.316a[2] (II.186 Erbse) αὐλή, ὅ ἐστι τὸ ἐξώτερον, *sc.* τοῦ οἰκήματος, EtG α 1399 (EtM α 2083) ὁ περιτετειχισμένος καὶ ὑπαίθριος τόπος. Seleucus Hom. fr. 22 Müller *ap.* Athen. 5.189b rejected this reading as allegedly equating αὐλή to οἶκος, cf. from Athen. *l.l.* Eustath. *Comm. Od.* 1483.39, then Orion Theb. 20.25f. On Homeric αὐλή see *LFrE* s.v., W. Richter, *AH* H, 23–32, F-G 216.

[35] Hecataeus became so often involved in Homeric questions because, as it seems, he essayed in several cases to refute information supplied by the Homeric poems. His polemic in *FGrH* 1 F 1 οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ

R. Tosi, *MCr* 25–8 (1990–93), 297 and in Montanari 147 n. 5 followed Kuchenmüller but would favour a reference to ἑκάταιον, a small statue of Hecate set at road junctions or outside house-doors.[36] This would revive an idea of Is. Vossius *ap.* Alberti, *Hesych. lex.* ii, 1776, 1453 n. 3, cf. Kayser 82.

Fr. 52

This gloss may mean 'come to a man's estate', as interpreted by *LSJ* s.v. ὑποζώννυμι III. εἰς ἄνδρας expresses 'the final outcome', as in Plato *Theaet.* 173b εἰς ἄνδρας ἐκ μειρακίων τελευτῶσι, *Septuag.* 20.12 ἐγενήθη εἰς γυναῖκα, see *LSJ* s.v. εἰς V.1, Schwyzer ii, 460, Gow on Theoc. 14.28 εἰς ἄνδρα γενειῶν. R. Nicolai, *MD* 28 (1992), 163–7 interpreted Call. *HyAp.* 85–6 ζωστῆρες Ἐνυοῦς/ἀνέρες as denoting an age-class: "giovani guerrieri ormai pronti per la vita adulta". The term could hardly be "de mulieribus dictum" as Salmasius took it (cf. Bach 78; this would perhaps necessitate a change into ἄνδρα). Could this lemma advance an interpretation of Homeric ζώννυσθαι (disputed: Σ A.R. 1.426b, 39.11 Wendel) as καθοπλίζεσθαι by describing a rite of passage somewhere in Greece?

Fr. 53

As Tyrwitt noticed, the lemma propounding μελαγκράνινος is a marginal Σ that crept into the text of Strabo. The couplet quoted therein seems to derive from P.'s discussion in *Hermeneia*, see *All. Poet. Ascr.* 2. This is a κάρπιμος kind of schoenus which μελαγκρανὶν καλοῦμεν διὰ τὸ μέλανα τὸν καρπὸν ἔχειν, Theophr. *HP* 4.12.1. More infrormation from P. could have been contained in the original form of Hsch. (Diog.) μ 620 μελάγκρανις· ὀξύσχοινος[37] ἢ τὰ ἄκρα μελανίζουσα.

φαίνονται, εἰσί is likely to include Homer, see *FGrH* ²Ia, Nachträge 535.26f. His language was a source of Call., cf. EtG (AB) γέγειος· ὁ ἀρχαῖος . . . εἴρηται παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ (*FGrH* 1 F 362) καὶ Καλλιμάχῳ [fr. 510] (deficit A) καὶ [*Hec.* fr. 102], then EtG (B = EtM 596.35) μέτασσαι· . . . παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ (*FGrH* 363 F 1) ἐστὶν 'ἔπισσαι' ~ [Call.] *Fr. inc. auct.* 735.

[36] On ἑκάταιον (or ἑκαταῖον) cf. Hsch. ε 1258 ἑκάταια· τὰ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν Ἑκάτης ἀγάλματα. τινὲς δὲ τὰ ἐν τριόδοις. On Hecate προθυραία or πρόδομος see S. I. Johnston, *Hecate Soteira*, Atlanta 1990, 23f., *id.*, *ZPE* 88 (1991), 217–24, Dover on Ar. *Ran.* 366, G. Tzifopoulos, *Horos* 10–2 (1992–98), 251f.

[37] Contrast the distinction of the two in Theophr. *l.c.* Theophr. is also ignored on the same issue in Hsch. ο 632 ὁλόσχοινος· ὀξύσχοινος.

μελαγκράνινος seems to take into consideration μελαγκρανίς 'black bog-rush (*schoenus nigricans*)' in Theophr. (> Pliny *NH* 21.113). Cf. ῥαφανίς/ῥαφάνινος, further κρανέινος (-άινος *v.l.*) in *HHHerm.* 460 with A-H-S ad loc., κράνινος in Paus. 1.21.5. μέλας-compounds attracted some attention in the erudite 3rd cent. BC as evidenced by the poetical onomasticon published as *SH* 991 (*All. Gramm. Ascr.* Perp. Adscr. 1).

Fr. 54

In *Il.* 1.514 Thetis requests the help of Zeus: ὑπόσχεο καὶ κατάνευσον/ (formulaic: *Il.* 2.112, *al.*). In 524 Zeus assents, κεφαλῇ κατανεύσομαι. P. had apparently expressed his preference for ἐπινεύσομαι here, which occurs in Homer only as an active verb. His choice might have been dictated by 1.528 κυανέῃσιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων, and he might have found the repetition of κατανεύω by Zeus in 524 and 527 οὐδ' ἀτελεύτητον, ὅ τί κεν κεφαλῇ κατανεύσω disturbing. Similar expressions of Zeus in *Il.* 15.75 (in a passage obelised for different reasons by Zenod., Aristoph. Byz. and Aristarch.) ἐμῷ δ' ἐπένευσα κάρητι/, *HHAphr.* 222 /τῇ δὲ Ζεὺς ἐπένευσε would support his reading. There is a slight difference in the meaning of the two verbs with ἐπινεύω implying a gesture to 'seal' what has been said and κατανεύω one to express agreement, see *LFrE* s.v. νεύω B.II.2, 3. The Homeric Σ often render κατανεύω with ἐπινεύω, which may have been perceived as more easily comprehensible, see Bulloch on Call. *l.s.* for a notion of formality in κατανεύειν, which is missing in ἐπινεύειν.

ἐπινεύσομαι here is an ancient variant attested in Imperial papyri (see West's *app. crit.*) and in Athen. 1.66c. Σ Gen. (II.300 Nicole) paraphrase τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐπινεύσω, but Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 144.7f. (I.221 van der Valk) insists on κατανεῦσαι/κατάνευσιν. It was probably through the influence of P. that it found its way into learned poetry, Call. *HyPal.* 131f. ὣς φαμένα *κατένευσε*· τὸ δ' ἐντελές, ᾧ κ' *ἐπινεύσῃ*/ Παλλάς [. . .] κορυφὰ Διὸς οὐκ *ἐπινεύει*/ψεύδεα (see Rengakos 1993, 140), and perhaps Arat. 267 (Zeus to Pleiads) σημαίνειν ἐπένευσεν (Athen. 11.490a: ἐκέλευσεν codd.) ἐπερχομένου ἀρότοιο.

οὕτως in the Homeric Σ is a technical term with which Aristarch. used to point out particularities of Homeric usage or to assert the correct reading against emendation. Sometimes these are introduced with ἄλλοι δέ or emphatically contra-distinguished with οὕτως . .

οὐκ/οὐχί etc. The οὕτως-supported reading normally agrees with the paradosis.[38]

Fr. 55

It would seem that in *Il.* 2.111 Ζεύς με μέγα Κρονίδης ἄτῃ ἐνέδησε βαρείῃ, P. read μέγα, which is a superior reading overwhelmingly supported by the direct and indirect paradosis. Zenod. seems to have done likewise, as the diple before this verse in cod. A followed by Σ a ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει 'Ζεύς με μέγας Κρονίδης' (μέγας seems to be the confused report of Ariston.), and Did.'s accurate report shows (Düntzer 99–100; *contra*: Barth 53f.). Aristarch. in his monograph Πρὸς Φιλίταν and ἔν τινι τῶν ἠκριβωμένων ὑπομνημάτων on *Il.* 9.169 (of which Σ no trace survives ad loc.) wrote μέγας. Didymus considered the attribution of μέγα to Aristarch. (now *apud* Ariston.) as a σχολικὸν ἀγνόημα, a mistake stemming from Aristarch.'s school (Lehrs 17), but it can not be excluded that Aristarch. διχῶς changed his mind (K. Linke on Dion. Thrax fr. 14). Aristarch. did not dwell on the question, but only contented himself with distinguishing two usages for μέγας, τοτὲ μὲν τὸ καθ' αὑτό, καθάπερ νῦν [*Il.* 2.111] and τοτὲ δὲ αὖ τὸ πρὸς τὴν κατὰ τὸν Αἴαντα τὸν ἕτερον διάκρισιν [*Il.* 16.358]. This is the only surviving specimen of the content of Πρὸς Φιλίταν. In support of this same reading, but perhaps independently from Aristarch., Callistratus ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἰλιάδος (p. 52f. Barth) adduced *Il.* 18.292, οὕτως προφέρεται ὥστε ὅμοιον εἶναι τῷ 'ἐπεὶ μέγας ὠδύσατο Ζεύς'. The question seems to involve the identical verse *Il.* 9.18 as well, where Σ A^{int} (Did.; II.401 Erbse) report <μέγα:> Ἀρίσταρχος σὺν τῷ σ̄ 'μέγας', cf. also the report of Ariston. *ibid.* 18c, again attributing μέγας to Zenod. On Homeric μέγα 'exceedingly' see Leumann 1950, 119–20.

Fr. 56

In a passage where looks matter, Odysseus ὑπόδρα ἰδών (*Il.* 2.245) strikes Thersites with his golden stick, ὁ δ' ἄρ ἕζετο τάρβησέν τε,/ ἀλγήσας δ' ἀχρεῖον ἰδὼν ἀπομόρξατο δάκρυ, *Il.* 2.268–9. P. proposed a κατὰ πάθος accentuation ἰδῶν, οἷον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ἰδεῶν. He con-

---

[38] For οὕτως in the Homeric Σ see M. Schmidt, *ZPE* 115 (1997), 47f., H. van Thiel, *ibid.* 31f. with n. 38 on οὕτως . . οὐχί.

joined ἀχρεῖον, whose meaning was disputed (Russo on *Od.* 18.163), with δάκρυ, perhaps reacting to the reappearance of ἰδών two lines later, 271 ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον, where the Σ T[il] note <ἰδών:> βλέπων, which may be a misplaced Σ on 269. Philoxenus fr. 3 Theodoridis *apud* Orion Theb. 22.3 (> Σ A *Il.* 2.269b) expounded ἀχρεῖον in this passage as an adj., τὸ ἀσθενὲς καὶ βάρους μὴ μετέχον.

Ariston. (i.e. Aristarch.) objected that Homer never employs ἰδέας for ὀφθαλμούς and that he employs here a commonplace construction, εὐτελῶς [see *LSJ Suppl.* s.v. I.3] σχηματίσας, as e.g. *Od.* 17.304 (Odysseus) νόσφιν ἰδὼν ἀπομόρξατο δάκρυ. ἴδοι for 'eyes' exhibits a displeasingly unscientific audacity, but P. may have adduced passages from οἱ νεώτεροι which in his judgement would support such an interpretation. The relevance of Hsch. ι 222 †ἴδοι· ὀφθαλμοί† ("ἴδει· θάλπει (Hes. *scut.* 397)" Latte) with this Σ (Kuchenmüller 110, Spanoudakis 2000, 34) is doubtful. To this reasoning Lehrs 46–7 compared Zenod. in Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 10.515a (III.108 Erbse) οὐδ' ἀλαοσκοπιήν: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει 'ἀλαὸν σκοπιήν' . . . ὁ ποιητὴς οὐδέποτε εἴρηκεν σκοπιὴν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, but Zenod. may have actually meant σκοπιή 'look-out post', which the Aristarchans misunderstood (Düntzer 53).

Fr. 57

In this difficult line P. read ὑπαλύξει and interpreted φρῖχ' as φρίκην 'shivering (due to chill)', cf. Σ A *Il.* 6.459 φρῖκα ἐδέξατο τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψύχους γενομένην φρίκην, Σ min. *Il.* p. xxii de Marco φρίξ· ἡ φρίκη τοῦ κρύους. The word φρίξ comes up as 'shivering fit' in a medical context in Hippocr. *Morb.* 2.68, *al.*, Nic. *Ther.* 778. P. apparently understood that a fish darting through the waves will avoid the chill after it has eaten Lycaon's fat, arguing that οἱ πίονες τῶν ἰχθύων καὶ εὔτροφοι τὸ ψῦχος ὑπομένουσι καὶ οὐ φθείρονται. His interpretation may take into account the widespread belief, confirmed by Aristotle,[39] that in winter-time the surface of the sea was its coldest part so that fish had to seek refuge at the bottom. Callistratus, a pupil

---

[39] Frr. 326–7, cf. also Opp. *Hal.* 1.470–2 (in spring, after winter, fish) φρῖκα θαλάσσης/ἀσπασίως προφυγόντες, ὑπεὶρ ἅλα καγχαλόωντες/θρώσκοντες θύνουσι, Ael. *NA* 9.57 and for this passage Porph. *QH* 1.43.10f. Sodano with reference to Arist. *Pseudepigr.* fr. 333.

and adherent of Aristoph. Byz., now mentioned only in Σ A (Ariston.), adopted P.'s argumentation and, according to Porph. *QH* 1.42.18 Sodano, an otherwise unknown Polycleitus (C. Wendel, *RE* XXI.2.1707 s.v. Polykleitos (9)), for whose name (πολύκλυτος, πολύκλυτ, πολυκλυτ codd.) C. G. Heyne (*Variae lectiones et observationes in Iliadem* viii, Leipzig 1802, 137) proposed to read Φιλητᾶς, espoused ὑπαλύξει and understood φρῖχ' as τῆς φρίκης τὴν ψυχρότητα. If Callistratus, as he often does, echoes his teacher's views, and if this enigmatic Polycleitus heretically neglects Aristarch.'s interpretation and follows Aristoph. Byz. instead — Porph. *op.c.* 1.37.7 Sodano ὁ δὲ βέλτιστος Ἀριστοφάνης might speak for that — the latter's understanding would appear to be a corrected version of P.'s line: fish darting along the waves will avoid the surface's chill by diving to the bottom of the sea in order to eat Lycaon's fat, cf. Porph. *l.c.* of Polycleitus and anonymously Eustath. *Comm. Il.* 1227.8 (IV.470 van der Valk). Of Aristoph. Byz. we are explicitly told (Σ A (Did.) b^1, T^{il} b^3, Eustath. *l.c.*) that he discerned the notion of intention implied by ὅς κε φάγῃσιν and, somehow inelegantly, emended it in ὥς κε φάγῃσι as ἡμαρτημένον . . ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς γραμματικῆς.

Aristarch. supported ὑπαΐξει (οὕτως ὑπαΐξει Ἀρίσταρχος, Σ A (Did.) b^1) and argued in detail, against P. (and Aristoph. Byz.?), that Lycaon νεοσφαγὴς μὲν οὖν ὢν καταδύσῃ ἐπὶ τὸ βάθος τοῦ ποταμοῦ, ἔνθα σὺν τοῖς ἰχθύσιν ὢν ἀπολιχμηθήσῃ τοῦ αἵματος and then μετεωρισθέντα ἐκβαλεῖ παρὰ θάλασσαν ὁ ποταμός, ἔνθα τις τῶν ἰχθύων σε κατέδεται ἐπὶ τὴν φρῖκα φερόμενος (Σ bT (ex.; Did. + ex.?) c). δεῖ γὰρ τὸν μέλλοντα ἰχθὺν φερομένου τινὸς γεύεσθαι ἄνω μετέωρον ὑπὸ τὴν φρῖκα τῆς θαλάσσης ἐλθεῖν (Σ A (Did.) b^1). Aristarch. also explained φρῖξ in a Homeric context as 'rippling surface of the sea' (cf. *Il.* 7.63–4, 23.692, *Od.* 4.402, always in association with μέλας), noting that Homer οὐδέποτε φρίκην [i.e. φρῖκα] τὸ ψῦχος εἴρηκεν.

ὑπαλύξει is transmitted in a number of MSS (West, ed. *Il.* ad loc.; ὑπαλύξας Apoll. Soph. 165.16) and some scholars would regard it as the vulgate[40] suppressed by Aristarch.'s conjectural ὑπαΐξει, which would be the only case of -ᾰισσ- in Homer, see, though, Chantraine *GH* i, 110 on such artificial shortenings. Cf., in a different context,

---

[40] *In primis* Valk ii, 2–4, 22f., Barth 159f. (ὑπαΐξει an error originating in the Chia, Σ bT *Il.* 21.126c) and, more recently, St. Hatzikosta, "*Il.*, 21, 126 and its alleged interpretation by Philetas", *AC* 63 (1994), 201–9.

Od. 5.430 (μέγα κῦμα) καὶ τὸ μὲν . . ὑπάλυξεν, then A.R. 2.70–2 κῦμα θαλάσσης/τρηχὺ θοὴν ἐπὶ νῆα κορύσσεται, ἡ δ' ὑπὸ τυτθόν/. . ἀλύσκει. However, as Richardson ad loc. noted, this is a grim variation on the theme of mutilation of the corpse by birds and dogs (*Il.* 22.335–6 with Ch. Segal, *The Theme of Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad*, Leiden 1971, 37). ἀίσσω applies to the rapid movement of these animals in *Il.* 15.694f., 17.460, 24.320 *al.* (esp. eagle) and 12.148, 15.580, 16.726, *al.* respectively, ὑπαΐξας of a snake in *Il.* 2.310 and only here of fish, so that it may be a remnant of a traditional image in a novel metaphor.[41]

πιμελώδης in Σ A (Ariston.) *Il.* 6.459 is a striking word which occurs only here in the corpus of the Homeric Σ. As POxy. 221.iv.29 ~ Porph. *QH* 1.45.14 Sodano evidences, it is an ancient term in the exegesis of this line and, as it goes along with P.'s argumentation on this passage, it may hark back to him. In favour of that speaks the compliance with Aristotelean doctrine, *HA* 520a6f. πιμελὴ δὲ καὶ στέαρ διαφέρουσιν ἀλλήλων. [. . .] ἔχει δὲ τὰ μὲν ἀμφώδοντα πιμελήν, τὰ δὲ μὴ ἀμφώδοντα στέαρ. [. . .] ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἰχθύων στέαρ πιμελῶδες καὶ οὐ πήγνυται, cf. also Mnesitheus, an Athenian dietician of the 4th cent. BC, *apud* Athen. 8.357c, Alexis *PCG* 83.1.

Fr. 58

The diple before *Il.* 21.252 (Achilleus) αἰετοῦ οἴματ' ἔχων μέλανος, τοῦ θηρητῆρος, shows that this was the original placing of a now lost Σ by Ariston. containing P.'s variant. Eustathius would draw on this and its traces are now extant in the Σ on the much discussed *Il.* 22.308. P. emended away οἴματ' for ὄμματ'. He would hardly ignore the recurrence of this term in *Il.* 16.752 (Patroclus) οἶμα λέοντος ἔχων, but he might have relied on *Il.* 8.349 (Hector) Γοργοῦς ὄμματ' ἔχων, and he might have considered the plural, which, except from comments dependent on this Homeric line, does not recur in Greek literature until Greg. Naz. *Carm. de se ipso PG* 1314.9 οἴμασι μαψιδίοις/, as unparalleled and therefore incorrect. Encouraged by θηρητῆρος, he emended the text so as to focus on the eagle's sharp sight, to which Homer attends in 17.674f. in a simile of Menelaus intensively looking for Antilochus among the battle-crowd (see further Thompson

[41] Of fish cf. later A.R. 1.572–4 τοὶ δὲ βαθείης/ἰχθύες ἀίσσοντες ὑπὲξ ἁλός etc., then frequently recurring in Opp. *Hal.* 2.593, 3.298 etc., Nonn. *D.* 45.166.

1936, 8). A further step to P.'s reading is οἱ δὲ (bT) or τινες (D, Gen.) or ἄλλοι δέ (Eustath.) reading μελανόσσου 'black-eyed' for μέλανος, τοῦ (θηρητῆρος), vexed in antiquity, cf. also POxy. 221.xiii.24–5 (saec. p.C. II; IV.104 Erbse) μέλανας ὀφθαλ]|μοὺς [ἔχοντος. Ludwich i, 465.3 and West, ed. *Il.* ii, 252 would attribute this to P.

Aristarchus founded his reaction to P. on *Il.* 22.308,[42] but went too far in wanting to establish οἴματ' in *Il.* 8.349.[43] Following his choice in 21.252, P., as Zenod. (Σ A ad loc.; II.363 Erbse), would adhere to ὄμματ'.

II. *Title, Content and Form of* Ataktoi Glossai

Σ A.R. 4.989i (fr. 44) transmit Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι[44] as the title of P.'s lexicon, Pamphilus (> Athenaeus) seems to have consistently employed ἐν Ἀτάκτοις, EtG ε 384/EtM ε 402 L. (fr. 43) simply give Γλῶσσαι. Pamphilus distinguished thus among the many Γλῶσσαι, P.'s Ἄτακτοι γλῶσσαι.[45] The title's meaning is obscure. Some have taken it to imply lack of an arrangement principle.[46] Arist. *Rhet.* 1414a30 employs τάξις to denote the disposition of a speech and later lexicographers employ this term to denote classification of books or entries, which may as well be random, such as Pollux in his prefatory note to Commodus ποιήσομαι τὴν ἀρχὴν . . . ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν· τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὡς ἂν ἕκαστον ἐπέλθῃ τάξομεν, Galen *Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων* (II.80 Müller) βιβλίον . . τὴν τάξιν τῶν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ γεγραμμένων ἐξηγούμενον, *id. Gloss. Hipp.* 19.62 Kühn or Hesychius' prefatory note to Eulogius προέθηκε δὲ [*sc.* Diogenianus] κατ' ἀρχὴν ἑκάστης λέξεως τριῶν

---

42 = *Od.* 24.538. He could also relate *Il.* 22.140 (κίρκος) ῥηιδίως οἴμησε μετὰ τρήρωνα πέλειαν and of course *Il.* 16.752 (quoted above). In eagle-similes Homer normally attends to the vulture's swoop, *Il.* 15.690f., 22.308f. (both of Hector), *Od.* 24.538 (Odysseus).

43 Nonetheless, a few lines further, in *Il.* 21.265 ὁσσάκι δ' ὁρμήσειε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, Aristarch. according to Σ A^{int}, bT (Did.) ad loc. (IV.186 Erbse), rejected the variant οἰμήσειε.

44 Discussions about the *At. Gl.* would include Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 654, von Blumenthal 2169, Pfeiffer 1968, 90f., N. G. Wilson, *CR* n.s. 19 (1969), 368–9, R. Tosi in Montanari 146f.

45 Athen. in frr. 39 and 42 wrote ἐν τοῖς Ἀτάκτοις apparently mistaking Pamphilus' reference as implying a title Ἄτακτα.

46 Pfeiffer 1968, 90, K. Alpers, *Gnomon* 47 (1975), 113. N. G. Wilson, *l.c.* considered as conceivable "arrangement by authors plus a section arranged by dialects".

ἢ τεσσάρων στοιχείων τάξιν. Easy consultation might have not been a matter of priority for an early lexicon such as P.'s (Christ-Schmid-Stählin 122), but it is implied by Strato T. 4, and all subsequent lexica in an ambience close to P., in one way or another, seem to have provided for that need.

Von Blumenthal's suggestion that Ἄτακτοι implies terms "not admitting definite interpretation", i.e. varying in meaning from dialect to dialect, draws only faint support from Proclus *In Euc.* 220f ἄτακτα προβλήματα, and becomes unlikely by the nature of P.'s work, since he does not seem to have focused on recounting the various senses of one word in different dialects. Such an understanding would also leave the fragments on Homeric passages out. Ἄτακτοι may imply diversity of contents (cf. Hermesian. T. 2.77–8 περὶ . . ./. . . πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλιήν) in compiling a collection of terms which, because of that, cannot be classified in a uniform format (Christ-Schmid-Stählin 122). The title would be meant to contrast to near-contemporary Γλῶσσαι-collections confining themselves in one region or one author or literary genre. Such collections predated P. γλῶττα describes terms difficult to comprehend (ἃ οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴπειεν ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ, Arist. *Poet.* 1458b32), whether obsolete, idiomatic or foreign.[47] Ar. Δαιταλῆς *PCG* 233 πρὸς ταύτας δ' αὖ λέξον Ὁμήρου γλώττας employs this term of Homeric vocables in Athenian school-praxis in 427 BC. Democritus' work Περὶ Ὁμήρου ἢ ὀρθοεπείης καὶ γλωσσέων 68 B 20a D-K[48] and the exegetes of rare Homeric terms contemptously called by Aristarchus as οἱ γλωσσογράφοι (always anonymous, and not securely datable), indicate that early collections of Homeric words bore the title Γλῶσσαι.[49] In support of this may be adduced a work Ἄτακτοι λόγοι ascribed to Simonides (*PMG* 653), for the content of

[47] Arist. *Poet.* 1458a22 classified γλῶττα in the category of ξενικόν. For idiomatic oral expressions as γλῶτται see W.-D. Lebeck, *Hermes* 97 (1969), 63–6. Ar. Δαιταλῆς *PCG* 233 was quoted by later collectors of γλῶτται 'obsolete (esp. poetic) words' such as Galen 19.66 Kühn or Pollux 2.109. Cf. also in this sense Arist. *Poet.* 1457b3f. and see A. Dyck, *HSCP* 91 (1987), 120 n. 4.

[48] "The wording of this title suggests a distinction between a 'straight' epic diction and the obsolete words needing explanation", Pfeiffer 1968, 42. See also C. J. Classen in *id.* (ed.), *Die Sophistik*, Darmstadt 1976, 243f.

[49] See A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 7 (1971), 231f. with a list of Homeric lexica inscribed Γλῶσσαι in p. 233. In general, Γλῶσσαι-lexica were of limited scope in contrast to Λέξεις-ones, where "every word which was peculiar in form or significance and therefore in need of explanation could be listed, whether it was out of date or still in use", Pfeiffer 1968, 198.

which Wil.'s (1912, 149 n. 4) suggestion that it was a collection of apophthegms from different sources is generally accepted. Furthermore, Suid. ε 3801 explains Euph. Μοψοπία ἢ Ἄτακτα by the statement ἔχει γὰρ συμμιγεῖς ἱστορίας.

Such an understanding does not preclude an arrangement of the terms discussed in *At. Gl.* in a fashion that could be practical for scholars and poets to look up. Zenod. *Glossai* (cf. fr. 1 Pusch = Σ *Od.* 3.444 ἄμνιον: . . . Ζηνόδοτος δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ δ' γλώσσαις τίθησι τὴν λέξιν) and Call. *Pinakes* (cf. fr. 435) adopted alphabetical order as an arrangement principle.[50] Call. in Ἐθνικαὶ ὀνομασίαι (fr. 406), an onomasticon subdivided in chapters such as Περὶ ὀνομασίας ἰχθύων and, probably, Περὶ ἀνέμων (fr. 404), Περὶ ὀρνέων (frr. 414–28), Μηνῶν προσηγορίαι κατὰ ἔθνος καὶ πόλεις (Pfeiffer i, 339), may be the first attested author to adopt classification according to subjects.[51] Pamphilus' arrangement by subjects, as it appears in Athen. (Schoenemann 78f., C. Wendel, *RE* XXIII.339.11f.), cannot be taken as an indication of P., but given the bewildering material discussed in the Coan's lexicon, general probability would point to that (cf. R. Tosi in Montanari 148–9). Conceivable would be a categorisation in chapters according to the various topics, in which material of any origin could be brought forward and discussed.

Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 652f. has shown that different factors combined to enhance dialect-studies in Hellenistic times. The levelling impact of koine, Peripatetic interest in this field, research in natural sciences involving geographically differing denominations of plants, trees etc., and the new turn to refined poetry, all contributed to provoke interest in dialects. From a literary point of view, Aristotle, in several passages, pointed out the importance of glosses in imparting solemnity to poetry and particularly to epic.[52] This might have prompted

---

[50] Earlier doubts as to whether alphabetisation was known by this time must now be left aside, cf. Adesp. Pap. Misc. *SH* 991 (270–230 BC) = *All. Gramm. Ascr.* Perp. Adscr. 1 and see R. Tosi in Montanari 151f. For Cos cf. inscr. 368 P-H (3rd cent. BC, though its dating appears uncertain), on which see L. W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetisation in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Brussels 1967, 18f, *id.* 27f. on the use of alphabetic order in Alexandria.

[51] See Schoenemann 44f., Pfeiffer 1968, 135. R. Tosi in Montanari 149–50 is sceptical.

[52] *Poet.* 1459b34 τὸ γὰρ ἡρωικὸν στασιμώτατον καὶ ὀγκωδέστατον τῶν μέτρων ἐστίν (διὸ καὶ γλώττας . . . δέχεται μάλιστα), 1459a8, 1460b11f., *Rhet.* 1406a6f. (usage of glosses as ποιητικόν), 1406b2. Of his followers, Clearchus Γλῶτται frr. 111–2 (both dubious) and Heraclides Ponticus Περὶ ὀνομάτων fr. 164 seem to have continued working in the field. On glosses in Hellenistic poetry in general see Wimmel

P. to collect and discuss glosses in a separate work. As such the Coan's lexicon was the first ever to appear.

The utility of such a compilation would be two-fold. On the one hand, it would help interpret earlier texts, esp. Homer, and on the other it would provide the material necessary for erudite poetry. Appeal to the dialect-meaning of certain words to promote the understanding of Homeric terms was a Peripatetic practice. Arist. *Poet.* 1461a9 offers an example of this method: τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν λέξιν ὁρῶντα δεῖ διαλύειν, οἷον γλώττῃ . . . καὶ τὸν Δόλωνα, 'ὅς ῥ' ἦ τοι εἶδος μὲν ἔην κακός', οὐ τὸ σῶμα ἀσύμμετρον ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόσωπον αἰσχρόν, τὸ γὰρ εὐειδὲς οἱ Κρῆτες τὸ εὐπρόσωπον καλοῦσι. Interest in glosses (not in the form of lexica) continued with the literary studies of Arist.'s disciples, cf. e.g. Praxiphanes frr. 14, 21 (Homer), 23 (Soph.). A lot of Homeric words had made their way into dialects, where by trivialisation they had acquired a new sense. The extant Homeric Σ teem with references to such words.[53]

In broad lines, lexicography owes its genesis to Homeric exegesis (R. Tosi in Montanari 154f.) and Crates T. 8.3–4 and Strato's cook in T. 4 imply that P.'s lexicon was mainly concerned with Homeric vocables. This appears to be confirmed by the surviving references. Cf. fr. 30 ἄωτον (of hapax *Od.* 22.10 ἄμφωτον — and fr. 29 ἄμφωξις?), fr. 31 γυάλα (of γύαλον, *Il.* 9x, esp. *Il.* 5.99), fr. 33 πέλλα (hapax *Il.* 16.642), fr. 37 κρήϊον (hapax *Il.* 9.206), fr. 38 κύπελλα (5x *Od.*, 5x *Il.*), fr. 41 ἴσθμιον (hapax *Od.* 18.300), fr. 45 ἀχαιαί (*Il.* 18.550/560 ἔριθοι ~ ἔριον ~ ἀχάη), fr. 46 ἄμαλλαι (*Il.* 18.553/554 ἀμαλλοδετῆρ), fr. 48 πρόξ (hapax *Od.* 17.295), fr. 49 σκῖρος (an 'Aristarchan' reading in *Il.* 23.332–3), fr. 50 σκύζη (*Il.* 8.483 σκυζομένης of Hera), and probably fr. 32 δῖνος (δίνη 6x *Il.* 21, 1x *Od.*), fr. 34 προχύτης (Homeric πρόχοος?), fr. 51 ὑπ' αὐνήν† (disputed Homeric αὐλή?), fr. 52 ὑπεζῶσθαι (Homeric ζώννυσθαι?) and an anticipated entry on ἄορ (see fr. 21.1g). Next, one lemma appears to be drawn on tragedy (fr. 44 ὄμπνιος) and one on archaic Lesbian lyric (fr. 42 ὑποθυμίς). For the last two and for the rest of the entries, it must be stressed that an effort to specify the source of the lemma should be attempted with caution, as the Coan seems to have gathered occurrences of both the term

1960, 71–98, G. A. Sheet, *AJPh* 102 (1981), 58–78, Papanghelis 58f. In Call. in particular see Schmitt 158–9, Rengakos 1992, 21f., R. Tosi, "Callimaco e i glossografi omerici", *Eikasmos* 8 (1997), 223–40.

[53] See Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 641f., Leumann 1950, 262f. The glossographers also took recourse to dialects, see A. Dyck, *HSCP* 91 (1987), 125–6.

in question as well as of similar terms from any possible literary source. So in fr. 51 ὑπ' αὐνήν† Hecataeus is cited, but the question may well be the debatable meaning of the Homeric term αὐλή; in fr. 50 σκύζῃ a verse apparently from comedy is treated, but the question may again be Homeric σκύζομαι. In a way, therefore, the lemmata printed in each fragment may be deceiving as to the terms which P. set out to study.

Each term was followed by a discussion, so that the form of the *At. Gl.* was not lexicographic in the strict sense of the word. The discussions appear to have been detailed, cf. frr. 37 κρήϊον, 41 ἴσθμιον, 44 ὄμπνιος or 46 ἄμαλλαι. Even when the references to P. are extremely concise, as in fr. 33 πέλλα or in fr. 43 ἕλινος, one would assume that the particular piece of information which has survived is an extract from a larger treatment. This impression is reinforced by the fact that P., in his lemmata, sometimes included poetic citations to illustrate his rendering of them and in other instances went into detail in recounting a habit from any part of the Greek world.

In fr. 40 ἴακχα and *Hermeneia* fr. 53 μελαγκράνινος, P. quoted two anonymous elegiac couplets. In fr. 42 ὑποθυμίς he probably referred to passages from Lesbian poets, in fr. 44 ὄμπνιος he discussed an iambic fragment probably from an unknown tragedy and in fr. 50 σκύζῃ he cited an iambic fragment probably from an unknown comedy. The dactylic form of fr. 47 βαίβυκος indicates that this may be drawn on a poem too. Citation of a poetic fragment is a well-known practice of early lexicography, cf. e.g. Simias *Glossai* fr. 30 Fränkel (Athen. 11.472e) κάδος· Σιμμίας ποτήριον, παρατιθέμενος Ἀνακρέοντος [*PMG* 373.1–2], and see in general Schneider 1856, 24. The exposition of epichoric customs as part of the interpretation of a gloss was also not uncommon, cf. e.g. Antig. Car. *apud* Athen. 7.297e ἐν τῷ Περὶ λέξεως (Wil. 1881, 174). P. gives account of an Argive habit in fr. 37 κρήϊον and another wedding custom is probably related in fr. 39 σποδεύς. Besides, objects related to the lower classes, such as fr. 29 ἄμφωξις, fr. 33 πέλλα, fr. 34 προχύτης, and cultic objects such as fr. 35 σκάλλιον appear to have been given attention.

III. *Sources*

There is a tendency nowadays to accept oral provenance for most of the terms discussed by P., which is assisted by the fact that some

entries derive from regions which produced little or no poetry.[54] This would not be impossible as the Coan could consult compatriots who had long lived abroad or foreigners visiting or living on Cos. Still, the indications suggest otherwise. There were limitless lexicographic treasures to be found in prose-accounts of local history, mythology or cult-practices, and those pertaining to Attica elicited considerable attention. The Ionian logographers, who had an interest in language themselves, and old Attic legal texts (Lys. 10.15f.) also contained a wealth of glosses. Early 'lyric' poetry, iambic and elegiac, and the Lesbian poets, were rich in rare or foreign words as indicated by their quotations in ancient lexica. Attic comedy employed not only dialectal or foreign words to produce a comic effect but also rare, vernacular terms and other, more common ones, in metaphoric applications. Fr. 51 and fr. 32, and perhaps frr. 31, 36, 38 and 49, indicate that P. was especially attentive to comic language. Fr. 37 treats a habit which is apparently recorded in Middle comedy. A lot of this information may have been absorbed by Eratosthenes in his studies on comic language, cf. frr. 32, 48. Mime, championed by Sophron in Syracuse who influenced Theoc., and which was practiced in Cos by Herodas, employed similar means. Contemporary or near-contemporary scientific handbooks, physiological and medical, also contained technical vocabulary of much use.

Fr. 51 ὑπ' αὐνήν† appears to cite Hecataeus of Miletus. An epichoric authority may be the source of fr. 35 σκάλλιον, recorded as a cult-object in the dialect of the Aeolians. For the two fragments concerning rustic vessels, fr. 29 ἄμφωξις and fr. 34 προχύτης, satyric drama is a conceivable source (rustic πέλλα discussed in fr. 33, seems to have been used in one). Fr. 29, fr. 39 σποδεύς and *Hermeneia* fr. 53 μελαγκράνινος look too high-styled to be of oral origin. The explanation of fr. 30 ἄωτον seems P.'s own etymological device. Also of literary provenance would be fr. 36 ἀμόρα; a similar form is said to be Sicilian (ἀμορβίτης) and ὄμωρος comes up in Epicharmus and Sophron. Fr. 38 κύπελλα seems to originate in a passage from a Syracusan poet (comedy/mime?). The Megarian gloss fr. 31 γυάλα is restored in a fragment from the near-contemporary comic poet

[54] N. G. Wilson, *CR* n.s. 19 (1969), 369, W.-D. Lebeck, *Hermes* 97 (1969), 64 n. 4 and R. Tosi in Montanari 205–8.

Dionysius of Sinope (active in Athens) in the same sense that P. records. Attic comedy may be the source of the Cyrenean sense recorded for fr. 32 δῖνος = ποδονιπτήρ (which was used in banquets, Hdt. 2.172.3) or of fr. 49 σκῖρος. The provenance of the Boeotian sense of fr. 33 πέλλα would also be literary, and probably poetic as the word had a long curriculum in poetry, cf. Adesp. *PMG* 997.8 (verses from a Boeotian poet).[55] Literary seems to be the source of fr. 40 ἰάκχα for which a Sicyonian distich is cited, and of the 'Lesbian' fr. 42 ὑποθυμίς. In the discussion of fr. 41 ἴσθμιον, anatomical terminology is related for which one may anticipate a medical source. The information concerning fr. 43 ἔλινος could hardly be an oral communication. The one contained in fr. 46 ἀμάλλα relates more to Homeric interpretation than to an enquiry of Coan landowners.

IV. *Range and Method*

The scope of dialects reviewed by P. is wide-ranged. It includes glosses which are Cyrenean from North Africa (fr. 32, cf. also ὕκης in fr. 18), Syracusan (fr. 38) and probably Tarentine or Heraclean (fr. 49) and Sicilian (fr. 36?) from Southern Italy, as well as terms from many dialects in Greece, Megarian (fr. 31), Boeotian (fr. 33), Aeolian (fr. 35), Argive (fr. 37), Sicyonian (fr. 40), and Lesbian (fr. 42). Some of these regions held ties with Cos, such as Argos/Sicyon (cf. Phlious in fr. 19), Lesbos and Megara,[56] and many are Dorian, such as Cyrene, or Taras — and perhaps Crete (fr. 16 ἄεμμα?, ὀρόδαμνος for Hsch. ο 1275 ὀροδεμνιάδες?) and Lacedaemon (χαός in Theoc. 7.5?). It is tempting to wonder whether P. discussed Coan glosses. Hesychius registers a handful of them, now listed in K. Bürchner, *RE* XI.2.1474.

---

[55] "Es würde sich lohnen, andere einzelnen Dialekten zugeschriebene Gefäßnamen ebenfalls unter dem Gesichtspunkt literarischer Provenienz zu betrachten" noted Leumann 1950, 268 following his discussion of πέλλα.

[56] For the association of Cos with Megara, cf. Strabo 14.2.6 (Rhodians) Δωριεῖς δ' εἰσίν, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἀλικαρνασεῖς καὶ Κνίδιοι καὶ Κῷοι, οἱ γὰρ Δωριεῖς οἱ τὰ Μέγαρα κτίσαντες μετὰ τὴν Κόδρου τελευτὴν οἱ μὲν ἔμειναν αὐτόθι, οἱ δὲ σὺν Ἀλθαιμένει τῷ Ἀργείῳ τῆς εἰς Κρήτην ἀποικίας ἐκοινώνησαν, οἱ δ' εἰς Ῥόδον καὶ τὰς λεχθείσας ἀρτίως πόλεις ἐμερίσθησαν, and, most probably, Timachidas of Megara *FGrH* 485 F 7. Cf. also Ps-Scymnus 551 ἄποικος . . Ἀστυπάλαια Μεγαρέων.

The Coan's erudition is not only displayed with the diversity of the material he discussed, the sources he used, the poetic citations and the width of his spectrum, but also with his learned diction. Words such as μελιτώματα in fr. 36, εὔχυλον in fr. 44, ἐρίθους in fr. 45 (this might be the lemma itself), δράγματα in fr. 46, πρωτοτόκος in fr. 48, κάπρας in fr. 50 and πιμελώδεις in fr. 57, each one of them being unusual or unique in the transmitting source, may well hark back to P. Noteworthy among these is the attention paid to medical terminology with εὔχυλον, πιμελώδεις (3x Hippocr.) as well as with the discussion of fr. 41 ἴσθμιον and with the interpretation of *Il.* 21.126 φρίξ 'shivering fit' (fr. 56). This is a feature that appears in P.'s poems too.

Of the way that P. tackled his lemmata, striking is his effort to specify the original sense of each word. So in fr. 42 ὑποθυμίς is restricted to mean not 'wreath', but a branch of myrtle around which a wreath is weaved, and in fr. 43 ἕλινος is not rendered as 'vine', but as 'branch of a vine'. The quest for the primary sense is a notable feature of fr. 41 ἴσθμιον and fr. 50 σκύζη (~ σκύζομαι) too. On the contrary, the meaning of the Homeric vocable ἄορ broadens in Arcadian and Aetolian usage, which P. might have discussed in *At. Gl.*, see fr. 21.1e.

The way that P. approached the Homeric terms he treated is most eloquently revealed from fr. 41 ἴσθμιον, in which various senses irrelevant to its Homeric occurrence are produced. This methodology may be an influence from the Peripatus: Praxiphanes fr. 21 ἄζα· ξηρασία· σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐν ἀγγείῳ ὀλίγον ὑγρόν· οὕτω Πραξιφάνης, apparently in his discussion of the Homeric hapax *Od.* 22.184 ἄζη 'dry dirt', adduced a sense extraneous to his Homeric subject. In the same fragment P. advances a κατὰ μεταφοράν interpretation from στέφανος: as ἴσθμιον can mean both 'neck' and its adornment, so στέφανος can mean '(part of the) head' and its adornment. This appears to have been one of his principal methods, cf. also the conceivable parallelism of ἔριον/ἔριθοι with ἀχάη/ἀχαιαί in fr. 45 and renderings such as κάπρα for σκύζη (both appropriate of animals) and see, possibly, *All. Gramm. Ascr.* Dubia 2 on πηγός = ἅλς. P. practiced μεταφοράν in his poetry too. His δολιχάορος in fr. 21.1 (ἄορ 'lance/sword') exactly corresponds to its absolute hapax (*Il.* 21.155) model δολιχεγχής (ἔγχος 'lance/sword'), and his possible ὕπαρνος to the Homeric hapax ὑπόρρηνος. The author (probably Apollod. of

Athens) of POxy. 2260.i.29–30, which transmits fr. 21, may be commenting on this practice when he notes about P. and others that they practise καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλο[ῖς] τὴν τοιαύτην τῶν ὀν[ομάτων μετάθεσιν (μετ. conj. Merkelbach). Here Aristotelian doctrine (τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστιν, *Poet.* 1459a7) plays a significant part.

P. also indulges in etymologising. In fr. 30 he explained ἄωτον as ποτήριον οὖς οὐκ ἔχον and in fr. 48 he advanced an unfortunate etymology πρόκας . . . οἷον πρωτοτόκους. From his *poetica* fr. 4 alludes to an etymology of ἀτραπός as 'irreversible' and P. might have also implied an etymology of Βούρινα as from βοῦς + ῥίς, see fr. 6e. The importance attached to even the most minute detail is demonstrated with fr. 46 where the number of handfuls comprising an ἄμαλλα is specified as two hundred, which was later set in doubt by Istrus. Fr. 41 mentions for ἴσθμιον the meaning 'guard? of a dagger', which is not known from any other source.

Strato T. 4.43 τὰ τοῦ Φιλίτα . . *βυβλία* indicates that P.'s lexicon extended to several book-rolls. This gains support from the wide range of dialects taken into account, as well as from Hermesian. T. 2.77–8 περὶ πάντα Φιλίταν/ῥήματα καὶ πᾶσαν τρυόμενον λαλιήν. The fame of his work might be due to its voluminous contents too.

V. Hermeneia, *Homeric Studies*

In a marginal Σ that crept into Strabo's text, P. is reported to have discussed ἐν Ἑρμηνείᾳ the exquisite term μελαγκράνινος (fr. 53), citing a couplet from what appears to be a decent poet. The content of this book (if it was one) remains highly speculative. M. Schmidt, *RhM* n.s. 6 (1848), 411 assumed it to be a lexicon separate but similar to *At. Gl.* Kuchenmüller 113 suggested that P. wrote notes in his copy of Homer and then published them in a separate work bearing the title Ἑρμηνεία. Pfeiffer 1968, 91 n. 4 noted that this is "a quite unusual title whether it means 'expression' . . . or 'interpretation'" and tentatively ascribed to this work frr. 56–58, which propose variant readings in Iliadic lines within the frame of their interpretation. Ἑρμηνεία may be an abbreviated version of the original title and a work thus entitled may be relevant to 'interpretation', most probably of Homer. In *At. Gl.* Homeric scholarship and dialec-

tal studies are interwined. P. might have written a separate chapter (or book) on Homeric passages, where clarification does not depend on the meaning of a specific word but takes the form of intertextual or literary interpretation, often involving textual emendation as following this interpretation. Before Aristarchus, attention was mostly paid to the interpretation of the text and only after him did interest in text-criticism grow (cf. H. van Thiel, *ZPE* 90 (1992), 31). The method does not seem to be much different from that known from *At. Gl.* (for *Hermeneia*'s ἀραιή/ἰξὺς . . κόμμα μελαγκράνινον, ὡς σχοίνῳ ἐζωσμένου, cf. fr. 44 ἀπέδωκε 'ὄμπνιον στάχυν' τὸν εὔχυλον καὶ τρόφιμον, fr. 51 σκύζης, ἀντὶ τοῦ τῆς κάπρας), so that Ἑρμηνεία may have been a chapter of the *At. Gl.* Such a conclusion is, though, uncertain. Von Blumenthal 2169–70 rejected the putatively Homeric character of this work, as μελαγκράνινος is not a Homeric word. In view of P.'s tendency to bring into discussion of Homeric questions material from any source, his objection loses strength. Besides, κρανέινος (*v.l.* κρανάινος) occurs in *HHHerm.* 460 and there are many Homeric rarities beginning with μελα-, see fr. 6c. That the treatment of this term might have been more extended than the interpolated reference in Strabo shows, might be suggested by Hsch. μ 620 (quoted in fr. 53).

As a scholar, P. is called γραμματικός and κριτικός in Suid. T. 1, ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός in Strabo T. 11. He also enjoyed a reputation as a Homeric scholar. Tzetzes T. 27, for whatever his testimony is worth, places him side by side with Zenodotus and Aristarchus among those who τῆς Ὁμηρικῆς ἐτυμολογίας ἐπεμελήθησαν and Crates T. 8.3–4 says of Euphorion that τὰ Φιλίτα/ἀτρεκέως ᾔδει· καὶ γὰρ Ὁμηρικὸς ἦν. In cod. Venetus (A) of Homer, which best preserves information from Aristarchus, survive five references to variants proposed or adopted by P. in the text of the *Iliad*. The Coan is not attested to have put in circulation an emended copy of the *Iliad* incorporating his suggestions[57] and, although it is impossible to determine whether

[57] Suid. T. 15 says that Zenodotus accomplished the first διόρθωσις of the Homeric epics. Before P., Antim. may have produced a critical study, see Pfeiffer 1968, 94 and Matthews 48, but also N. G. Wilson, *CR* n.s. 19 (1969), 369 postulating a separate book of *problemata*. Aristotle did not produce an edition of the *Iliad* either, see Pfeiffer *op.c.*, 71–2, N. J. Richardson in Montanari 9, J. Irigoin in *ibid.*, 39.

these were part of the *At. Gl.* or of the *Hermeneia*,[58] one would anticipate a work in the form of interpretative notes, such as the one surmised for *Hermeneia*. Some of P.'s suggestions are conjectural (frr. 56, 58 and probably 54), others may support the paradosis (fr. 57, probably fr. 55, cf. fr. 49). It can be regarded as certain that they were influential and that all five references in the Homeric Σ survive through Aristarchus.

Aristarch. T. 10 is said to have written a σύγγραμα entitled Πρὸς Φιλίταν to counter P.'s views, which he obviously held arbitrary and deficient. Aristarchus published similar monographs, mostly of polemic character, such as Πρὸς Κωμανόν or Πρὸς τὸ Ξένωνος παράδοξον (Pfeiffer 1968, 213, Fraser i, 467). He would not have engaged himself in this if P.'s views were not current. The origins of this pamphlet are to be sought in Aristarchus' antipathy towards Zenodotean conjectures as well as towards those of his contemporaries who followed them. An immediate influence of P.'s Homeric doctrine can be assumed to have been exerted on his trustee Zenodotus. Despite the paucity of the information at our disposal, two points of contact emerge: in *Il.* 2.111 = 9.18 Zenodotus in agreement with P. read μέγα and in *Il.* 8.349 he read ὄμματ', as P. did in *Il.* 21.252. A broader impact concerning the method of approaching the Homeric text can be detected in other instances. P.'s arbitrary interpretation in *Il.* 2.269 ἰδῶν = ὀφθαλμῶν may have (wrongly) been thought by the Aristarchans to be parallel with Zenodotus' in *Il.* 10.515 σκοπιήν = ὀφθαλμούς. In *Il.* 2.89 Zenodotus (*Glossai* fr. 2 Pusch *ap.* Porph. *QH* 1.26.8 Schrader) derived βοτρυδόν from βότρυς, a bird not known from any other source and therefore, apparently, a device of his own, see Pusch 193–4 and on similar cases K. Nickau, *RE Suppl.* XA.40.44f. Ptolemaeus Epithetes, a pupil of Hellanicus Chorizon who is said in Suid. π 3035 to owe his nick-name διότι ἐπέθετο τῷ Ἀριστάρχῳ, shows the lasting effect of Zenodotean readings in a passage of interest. In fr. 1 Montanari *apud* Σ A (Did.) *Il.* 2.111b (I.203 Erbse) Ptolemaeus τὰς Ζηνοδότου γραφὰς ἐκτιθέμενος (T. 2 Montanari) sides with

[58] In his first edition (1833) Lehrs 30 postulated an edition of Homer by P., but see 26 n. 8a of the third edition (1882). From Tzetzes *l.c.* Bach 80 surmised a separate book on Homer, against whom cf. already Susemihl i, 178 n. 26. R. Schmidt, in A. Nauck, *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Halle 1848, 317 n. 29, considered these part of the *At. Gl.*, Kuchenmüller 113 part of *Hermeneia*. Rengakos 1993, 15 n. 1 is cautious.

Zenodotus (and P. fr. 55) in reading μέγα in *Il.* 2.111 against Aristarchus' conjectural μέγας, which was later denied by his school.

The Coan's Homeric influence seems to have persevered in Aristoph. Byz. and his circle. In contrast to P., Aristoph. Byz. understood πρόξ as a roe deer (δορκάς), not as a red deer (ἔλαφος), and his pupil Callistratus espoused μέγας in *Il.* 2.111, where P. had apparently read μέγα. On the other hand, Callistratus (and Aristoph. Byz.?) followed P. fr. 57 in interpreting and emending *Il.* 21.126–7 against Aristarchus. In another instance, according to Σ Gen. (Did.?) *Il.* 21.169c (V.161 Erbse), he (p. 175f. Barth) followed Zenodotus in reading ἰθυκτίωνα against Aristarchus' and the vulgate's ἰθυπτίωνα. Callistratus, in several instances, opposed Aristarchan opinions and is said to have made a personal attack on Aristarchus on the grounds of his slovenly appearence as φέροντός τι καὶ τοῦ τοιούτου πρὸς παιδείας ἐξέτασιν, Athen. 1.21c, see Fraser i, 467. Callistratus ἐν Ὑπομνήμασι Θρᾳττῶν Κρατίνου (*PCG* T. 39) rendered πέλικα as κύλικα in accordance with P.'s information (fr. 33). Apollod. of Athens? POxy. 2260.i.28, after quoting fr. 21, seems to place P. in a line of poets expressing peculiar views on Homeric glosses in their poems καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλο[ῖς (whatever the latter means).

Both Aristarch. and P. (the latter possibly as the originator) agree on the alleged intensifying force of prefix νη- (see fr. 7a), but in the 'Homeric' fr. 17 δμωίδες . . . ἄγουσιν ἔρι P. construes ἄγω with an inanimate object, which Aristarchus (falsely) declared as an impossible construction in Homer. Specimens from *Against Philitas* may not only be preserved in the Homeric Σ (frr. 54–58), but also in Diogenianus (frr. 31?, 49, 51 — from Didymus?). P. seems to have drawn material from a wide range of sources, esp. comedy, to interpret the Homeric employment of rare words. A constant objection to his interpretations is that they do not find themselves in harmony with Homeric usage. Recourse to dialect glosses would seem an anti-Aristarchan way of dealing with Homeric terms. Aristarchus made very restricted, and critical, use of dialectography (Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 647). His treatment of P.'s views would be influenced by his coevals who supported them. Aristarchus possibly turned against P.'s method, picking up current examples to contradict it.

VI. *Influence, Survival*

From Strato T. 3 it becomes apparent that the Athenian public was not only familiar with P. as one of the κωμῳδούμενοι, but also with his lexicon, which was a novelty as such and a phenomenon of erudition. P.'s own poetry profited from his glossographic researches. From the little we know of his poems, although he avoided an overloaded excess of obscure terms, he employed Cretan? ἄεμμα in fr. 16, Cyrenean ὕκης in fr. 18, Arcadian and Aetolian ἄορ in fr. 21.1, possibly Ionic? θρήσσασθαι in fr. 8, Attic ὄμπνιος in fr. 5a and perhaps Lacedaemonian χαός, if its occurrence in Theoc. 7.5 harks back to *Demeter*. As the notions of scholar and poet are amalgamated, it would seem immoderate to assume that every gloss occurring in P.'s poetry was discussed in *At. Gl.*, but this seems certain with ὄμπνιος and it looks so with ἄορ too, see fr. 21.1e.

Crates T. 8 says that Euphorion κατάγλωσσ' ἐπόει τὰ ποιήματα and that he shared interest in subjects, attention to which was first drawn by P. (καὶ τὰ Φιλίτα ἀτρεκέως ᾔδει).[59] A.R. 4.989 στάχυν ὄμπνιον glances at P. fr. 44 ὄμπνιον στάχυν. Lyc. 708 employs πέλλα in the way that P. fr. 33 explained it ('drinking cup'), and in 621 Δηοῦς . . . ὄμπνιον στάχυν he takes account of P.'s influential lemma on ὄμπνιος. In *Ther.* 758 (spider-bite) γλῶσσα δ' ἄτακτα λέληκε Nic. employs unpoetic and unHellenistic ἄτακτος in what seems to be an oblique reference to the title of P.'s lexicon. In *Alex.* 181 Nic. employed ἕλινος = ἄμπελος, which a well-informed ancient Scholiast explained with a reference to P. fr. 43. A Hellenistic source may as well lurk in the occurrence of this term in Nonn. *D.* 12.299. If Doric (Lacedaemonian) χαός, employed in Attic comedy by Aristophanes, in Theoc. 7.5 is drawn on P., then Alex. Aet. *CA* 7.1 would pick it up from him too. P.'s researchs may also have revivified interest in obsolete Homeric terms such as fr. 33 πέλλα (Theoc., Nic.), fr. 31 γύαλον (Call.), fr. 48 πρόξ (A.R., Call., Nic.) and perhaps *All. Gramm. Ascr.* Dub. 1 μέροπες (Call., A.R.) and Dub. 2 πηγός (Call., Euph., Lyc.).

It was Call., more than anyone else, who seems to have adorned his poems with glosses which he picked up from P. He knows ὄμπνιος

---

[59] See Susemihl i, 395 n. 101. This is confirmed by his extant fragments. Groningen 259–60 provides a list of glosses in Euph.'s fragments.

(3x, see fr. 5a.a) and in *HyDel.* 31 ἄορι τριγλώχινι he employs ἄορ in the sense τρίαινα, which might reflect P.'s interpretation of *Il.* 14.385 (Poseidon brandishing) δεινὸν ἄορ τανύηκες, see fr. 21.1e. In fr. 186.27 he picks up fr. 46 ἄμαλλαι and in fr. 399 = *HE* 68 he seems to employ ἄωτος in accordance with the etymology advanced by P. fr. 30. In *HyAp.* 33 Call. derives ἄεμμα from a verse in *Demeter* (fr. 16) and ζωστῆρες Ἐνυοῦς in *ibid.* 85 might glance at fr. 52. Call. also uses ὕκης (2x, one by emendation), which P. fr. 18 seems to have employed in the Cyrenean sense ἐρυθρῖνος. In *HyPal.* 131f. Call. pays heed to a reading espoused by P. fr. 54 in *Il.* 1.524. So does, perhaps, Arat. 267. In each of these cases Callimachean inception shows itself sufficiently recreative. Istrus, Call.'s pupil, took issue with P. regarding fr. 46 ἄμαλλαι.

The subsequent efflorescence in the field of glossography might to some extent be due to P. The Coan's lexicon first exercised an impact on scholars of his immediate surroundings. His interest in medical vocabulary took a concrete form with his compatriot and contemporary Xenocritus, who composed the first in the long list of Hippocratic glossaries. In the next generation, Philinus, another Coan physician, became widely known as a medical glossographer.[60] P.'s work in glossography provoked the interest of other περίεργοι scholars. Simias of Rhodes is called γραμματικός in Strabo 14.2.13 (among μνήμης ἄξιοι Rhodians), Suid. σ 432 Σιμμίας and in the lemma of *AP* 6.113 (*HE* 3). According to Suidas, Simias ἔγραψε Γλώσσας βιβλία γ′ (*CA* 27; the title may be abbreviated), of which only four references survive in Athenaeus. He seems to have drawn on various dialects (fr. 32 Fränkel (Athen. 7.327e) relates a Cretan gloss)[61] and he discussed Homeric terms as well. In fr. 29 Fränkel (Athen. 15.677c) he takes account of P. fr. 41 in explaining Homeric ἴσθμιον as στέφανον. Unfortunately, nothing can be said about the arrangement of his work.

---

[60] See Pfeiffer 1968, 92 n. 2, Fraser i, 365. On Xenocritus cf. fr. 311 Deichgräber *apud* Erotianus 31 (4.24 Nachmanson) Ξενόκριτος γὰρ ὁ Κῷος γραμματικὸς ὤν ['although he was a γραμ.'] . . . πρῶτος ἐπεβάλετο τὰς τοιαύτας ἐξαπλοῦν φωνάς and see M. Fuhrmann, *RE* IXA.1533 s.v. Xenokritos (4). P.'s influence on Philinus was only indirect. In his various works Philinus displayed a tendency to explain botanical and medical terms and wrote a treatise in six books against Bacchius' Hippocratic glossary (fr. 311 Deichgräber), see H. Diller, *RE* XIX.2.2193–94 s.v. Philinos (9), H. von Staden, [3]*OCD*, 1160 s.v. Philinus (1).

[61] Simias interprets φάγρος, known as the name of a fish, as γένος λίθου following a Cretan usage, ἡ γὰρ ἀκόνη κατὰ Κρῆτας φάγρος. The rare term ἀκόνη

It is a natural conception that Zenodotus became interested in glossography through the influence of P. He wrote Γλῶσσαι, concerned mainly with Homeric glosses, and Ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις, where literary glosses were discussed in relation to their meanings in various dialects. There is every probability that the latter was part of the former, see (despite Pusch 175–6) K. Nickau, *RE Suppl.* XA.42.12f. Here P. may have served as a starting point. As with the *At. Gl.*, in Zenod.'s *Glossai* dialect research was combined with Homeric exegesis, see R. Tosi in Montanari 151–2. A follow on of the Coan's interest in medical terms is indicated with two references to the *Ethnikai lexeis* in Galen *Gloss. Hipp.* 19.129 Kühn. Besides Zenodotus' editorial work on Homer, Alexander of Aetolia was assigned in Alexandria with the responsibility of revising the tragic and satyric texts, and Lycophron the comic ones. Apparently both engaged in interpretation of vocables occuring in these texts. Not much is known about Alex. Aet.'s philological work, though *CA* 16, propounding δροίτη as σκάφην ἐν ᾗ τιθηνεῖται τὰ βρέφη, may preserve a specimen of his activity. Knowledge of P. can be postulated on the basis of *CA* 7.1 χαός, which Theoc. 7.5 conceivably drew from *Demeter*. With regards to Lyc., there are indubitable traces of *Demeter* and of the *At. Gl.* in his *Alexandra*. Lyc.'s lexical studies on ancient comedy, to which P. appears to have been especially attentive, can be regarded as a continuation of P.'s work in a new area. His work Περὶ κωμῳδίας in at least nine books seems to have been principally concerned with word-interpretation and might have been, as Fraser put it, "a very primitive piece of criticism". Most of the surviving references look like unqualified ad hoc assumptions, which were assailed by Eratosthenes (ἠπάτηται).[62]

Nic.'s poetry is replete with glosses, the sources of which are for the most part unknown, see Schneider 1856, 208–10. Since Nic. exhibits an intimacy with the *At. Gl.* (and *Demeter*) in his poetry, one may anticipate the same for his glossographic work. Three books of his *Glossai* are attested, but since two glosses beginning with β- are

---

may reflect vocabulary from Simias, esp. as †ἀκονίας appears as a fish's name in Num. Her. *SH* 579.

[62] See K. Ziegler, *RE* XIII.2.2324.36f., Pfeiffer 1968, 119–20, Fraser i, 450, ii, 661 n. 86. A collection of his unfortunate comments can be found in Nesselrath 172 n. 64. Pfeiffer *l.c.* called for caution in condemning Lyc.'s work as all extant references are screened by Eratosthenes.

assigned to the second book and two more beginning with γ- and δ- to the third book, one envisages — except for alphabetical order — a voluminous work. In fr. 140 (Athen. 11.483a) Nicander, along with Silenus, explains κύπελλα as ἐκπώματα σκύφοις ὅμοια in a discusson that ends with a reference to P. fr. 38, and in fr. 130 he discusses the cultic garland βάκχος, which is comparable to fr. 40 ἰάκχα. The suspicion about Philitan presence in Nic.'s *Glossai* gains further support from the community of interests: a large part was devoted to Homeric criticism (fr. 125 αἰσυητήρ, fr. 128 ἀνδράγρια, fr. 131 βουγάιος, fr. 133 δ' ἀμνίον = δάμνιον, fr. 140 κύπελλα, fr. 145 τριτώ); in fr. 121 Nic. discusses βάκχυλος as an ἄρτος σποδίτης παρ' Ἠλείοις, in fr. 138 κελέβην as ποιμενικὸν ἀγγεῖον μελιτηρόν followed by three quotations from Nic.'s compatriot poet, Antimachus (*Thebais* frr. 20, 22, 23). Attention to medical terminology in *Glossai* is revealed from two Hippocratic glosses, frr. 124, 135 (both in Erotianus). Σ Nic. *Ther.* 382a (163.20 Crugnola) = *Glossai* fr. 143 μάλκη evidence that Nic. made use of his dialectal researches in his poems.

Soon, material from the *At. Gl.* was absorbed in dictionaries of all kinds. The Coan's name appears next to that of Simaristus (frr. 34, 38), Timachidas of Rhodes (fr. 40 looks like a direct quotation, fr. 41, and fr. 42?) and Silenus (fr. 41, and fr. 38?), while echoes of views developed in *At. Gl.* can be discerned in P(t)olemarchus (fr. 37) and Seleucus Hom. (frr. 33, 42?). Apollodorus of Athens reviewed *At. Gl.* fr. 33 in interpreting the word πέλικα and he discussed the gloss ἔλινος with reference to fr. 43. Entries derived from ancient commentaries on Hellenistic poets (fr. 43, probably also frr. 44, 46, 48) indicate that Theon took into account the *At. Gl.* All these figures belong to the 2nd/1st cent. BC and may have read P. first hand. A milestone in the survival of information drawn on *At. Gl.* is the comprehensive Γλῶσσαι of Clitarch of Aegina (1st cent. BC), for which seven books are attested and a variety of terms of bewildering width (see *in primis* Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 660–2). His lexicon was disposed according to topics and as each lemma seems to have contained a list of possible meanings, it was probably a compilation from earlier, individual collections. In fr. 33 Clitarch agrees with P. in the bucolic interpretation of the word πέλλα, but it is doubtful whether he had direct access to *At. Gl.* In Athen. 7.300f he explains Cyrenean ὕκης as ἐρυθρῖνος, the interpretation of which in Athen. 7.327b is apportioned to Zenodotus. All this information ended up in Pamphilus' Περὶ γλωσσῶν ἤτοι λέξεων, consisting of no less than 95 books.

Pamphilus' name appears in the same breath as P.'s in fr. 30. From there, in strongly reduced form, it migrated to Athenaeus and Diogenianus/Hesychius. There are still entries in Hesychius, where it can be assumed that they once contained information from the *At. Gl.*, cf. fr. 34 προχύτης with Hsch. π 4103, fr. 42 ὑποθυμίς with *id.* υ 642 or fr. 53 μελαγκράνινον with *id.* μ 620. Another means of survival is via Methodius' and Orion's etymological lexica (both 5th cent. AD), principal sources of the Byzantine Etymologica, which reproduce material from commentaries on Homer, A.R., Call., Nic. and Theoc.

Alleged Grammatical Ascriptions

I. *Spurium*

π ρ ο κ ρ ό σ σ α ς

EtM (M) 689.24 Gaisf. προκρόσσας {κέκληκε Φιλητᾶς (-τάς M)} τὰς νῆας λέγει, Ἰλιάδος Ξ (ζ′ M).

Right after EtM 689.15 Προικόνησος (fr. 48), cod. M of EtM adds this piece of information about προκρόσσας, but P.'s involvement appears to be only due to a confusion with the following lemma προκρόσσας ἔρυον (*Il.* 14.35)· διὰ τὰς νῆας λέγει, Ἰλιάδος ζ′ (i.e. Ξ) etc. In the source of this lemma, Orion Theb. 134.29, there is no trace of P.

II. *Dubia*

1. Hollis 1996, 58 n. 15, discussing the possibility of verbal echoes from P. in Hermesian. T. 2, suspected that θ ο ή ν of Bittis, "which has the air of a learned tease", could have been discussed in *At. Gl.*, to which Hermesianax seems to refer immediately after θοήν.

In Strato *PCG* 1.6–8 (~ T. 4) the gloss μέροπες occurs three times in three consequent verses, first in the sense 'people, men', then misunderstood by the cook's master as Meropes 'Coans':

> '⌊πόσους κέκ⌋ληκας μέροπα⌊ς ἐπὶ δεῖπνο⌋ν; λέγε.'
> 'ἐγ⌊ὼ κέκ⌋ληκα Μέροπας ἐπ⌊ὶ δεῖπνο⌋ν; χολᾳ̂ς.
> τοὺς δὲ Μέροπας τούτους με γ⌊ιν⌋ώσκειν δοκεῖς;'

*A. S. Hollis wondered whether the erudite cook's insistence on μέροπας harbours an entry in the *At. Gl.*, which would explain the application of this term to P.'s homeland. This is the first of the Homeric καινὰ ῥήματα (*ibid.* 3) which the cook utters, cf. *ibid.* T. 4.42 of P. studying these. The fact that some would associate this term with the legendary Coan king Merops, the father of Phaethon (Wil. *Kl. Schr.* i, 144, J. Diggle, *Euripides,* Phaethon, Cambridge 1970, 7 n. 1), is in favour of Hollis' suggestion, cf. Hsch. (Diog.) μ 886 μέροπες· . . . ἢ ἀπὸ Μέροπος, τοῦ πατρὸς Φαέθοντος, Κῴου. λέγονται

δὲ καὶ Κῷοι Μέροπες (an unparalleled piece of information). H. Koller, *Glotta* 46 (1968), 23f. has in fact argued for the possibility that a specifically Coan, 'oral' formula Κόως . . πόλις Μερόπων ἀνθρώπων now attested in *HHAp.* 42, may have been misunderstood early on as being capable of applying to all mortal people. The impetus of μέροπες in Hellenistic verse (Call. *Hec.* fr. 115.2, A.R. 4.536) may partly be due to this conceivable entry in *At. Gl.* For possible *a posteriori* associations cf. Anon. *AP* 16.269.2, 271.1.

2. A similar suspicion has been raised (cf. Rengakos 1992, 24f., Massimilla 242) for the controversial Homeric πηγός (see Erbse on Σ bT *Il.* 9.124a (II.423), J. Chadwick, *BICS* 39 (1994), 3) which in Strato's fragment *PCG* 1.36 π η γ ὸ ς πάρεστι; comes up as 'salt'. The derivation of this usage was excellently explained by V. Schmidt *apud PCG ad loc.* from *Od.* 5.388–9 κύματι πηγῷ/πλάζετο = εἰν ἁλί, whence πηγός = ἅλς, cf. Euph. *CA* 127 πολύτροφα δάκρυα βύνης (= τοὺς ἅλας), Adesp. *PCG* 1146.37 (Hellenistic) Νηρέως τε χῦμα πηγόν. The origin of this κατὰ μεταφοράν application could hardly be attributed to Strato, but it would quite happily accord with P.'s practices, so that here we might be dealing with a detail from his conceivable discussion of πηγός. If so, for P. πηγός = 'white', as for Lyc. 336 (senile Priam) πηγῷ . . . πλόκῳ, against Antim. fr. 185 and the glossographers fr. 25 Dyck.

III. *Perperam Adscripta*

1. [PHib. ii no 172, pap. *c.* 270–230 a.C., ed. E. G. Turner (1955) = Adesp. Pap. Misc. *SH* 991]

This 3rd cent. BC poetical onomasticon contains compound adjj., including some thirty novel ones, drawn on a wide range of Greek literature. Its *editor primus*, E. G. Turner, raised the possibility that it may be an Appendix to P.'s lexicon. Still, as Pfeiffer 1968, 91–2 observed, this onomasticon does not contain γλῶσσαι, i.e. dialectal or obsolete vocables, and, moreover, there is no discussion of the words listed, which, as Strato T. 4 and the surviving references attest, was a feature of P.'s lexicon. Still, Fraser i, 456 would leave the question open, whereas R. Tosi in Montanari 149 raises the possibility of it being an epitome of P.'s lexicon. The character of P.'s *Ataktoi* and this poetical list is so different that one would not like

to postulate an immediate parentage of the latter from the former. It is, nevertheless, an important testimony of the tools which erudite poets had at their disposal, and possibly of the impetus in the field of lexicography granted by P.'s studies.

2. From Strato T. 4, Bach 70 asserted that "iam vero satis probabiliter concluditur vocabula a Stratone laudata olim habuisse sedem in Philetae Glossario". The vocabulary is Homeric: μοιρούς, δίπτυχα, μίστυλλον, ὀβελοῖσιν appear close to each other in *Il.* 1.460f., 2.423f., see R. Kassel, *ZPE* 14 (1974), 123. Latte *Kl. Schr.*, 654 n. 53 (cf. also H. Dohm, *Mageiros*, Munich 1964, 198f., E. Livrea, *ZPE* 40 (1980), 31) put things right: the target is the contemporary fashion of culinary poetry employing, as does the cook, elevated Homeric diction for commonplace objects and activities. P. comes into question as the author of the most renowned lexicon of that time.

APPENDIX I

FOUR VERSE CITATIONS IN HESYCHIUS[1]

Due to the uncertainty surrounding these ascriptions, it has seemed sensible to refrain from referring to the information possibly supplied by them for *Demeter* in the relevant chapter. I have, nonetheless, allowed for three exceptions with ε 6569 ἕτερον πόδα, ο 1275 ὀροδεμνιάδες and υ 243 ὕπαρνος ποίμνη, which seem, with good probability, to provide fragments of P., though again I chose to stand on the side of caution by not publishing them as separate fragments.

ι 60 ἰανοκρήδεμνος· ἰοῖς ὅμοιον τὸ ἐπικράνισμα . . .

"Alexandrinus ni fallor poeta" M. Schmidt = Anon. fr. 175 Schneider. ἰανοκρήδεμνος means 'with a dark head-dress', cf. Alcm. *PMGF* 1.68–9 νεανίδων/ἰανογ[λ]εφάρων, Adesp. Pap. Hex. *SH* 906.13 ἰανόφρυν and cf. Q.S. 4.381 (mourning Thetis) κυανοκρήδεμνος/. The parent is λιπαροκρήδεμνος 'with a bright head-band', a Homeric hapax of Charis in *Il.* 18.382, 3x in *HHD* (2x of Hecate, 1x of Rhea). Its meaning and -κρήδεμνος suggest that the adj. applies to a woman and the lemma seems to envisage a violet-coloured head-dress. I might wonder whether this could be a novel attribute to mournful Demeter, who is 4x κυανόπεπλος in the *HHD* and in deep sorrow goes around the world covered with a dark head-dress, 41–2 κρήδεμνα δαΐζετο χερσὶ φίλῃσι,/κυάνεον δὲ κάλυμμα κατ' ἀμφοτέρων βάλετ' ὤμων, cf. 182–3 and see Richardson on v. 42. Note also the cult of Demeter Melaina in Phigalia ὅτι καὶ ἡ θεὸς μέλαιναν τὴν ἐσθῆτα εἶχε, Paus. 8.42.4 This may derive support by the Scholiast's explanation ἰοῖς ὅμοιον, as Demeter is closely associated with violets, see Richardson on *HHD* 6 (Persephone gathering) ἴα καλά, and cf., in Sicily, Bacch. 3.2 Δάματρα ἰοστέφανόν τε Κούραν. Lycidas in Theoc. 7.64 wears a λευκοΐων στέφανον and ἴα ἀμφότερα feature in Philetas' garden in Long. 2.3.4.

κ 74 κατὰ δίψιον εἶδος· καύματος . . .

malim καταδίψιον Meineke auctore

A. Meineke, *Philologus* 13 (1858), 557 acknowledged this entry as a verse citation in the form καταδίψιον ἶδος/καύματος (Anon. fr. 180 Schneider ~ Frust. Adesp. Auct. *SH* 1083). The phrase is perhaps an echo of the disputed Iliadic *unicum* 4.171 πολυδίψιον Ἄργος (see Erbse (I.482) on Σ *Il.* 4.171c),

---

[1] This is a condensed and improved version of entries discussed in Spanoudakis 2000.

which would lend colour to Meineke's printing καταδίψιον. δίψιον is Callimachean, *SH* 240.10, cf. Nic. *Ther.* 147, 436 ἐπιδίψιος ἄτη/, 12x in Nonn. *D.*, but the term in need for explanation here is εἶδος 'heat' (first [Hes.] *Scut.* 397), which is normally glossed as καῦμα, e.g. by Hsch. ε 750 εἴδεος· θάλπους, καύματος. I had initially (Spanoudakis 2000, 34f.) thought of Chalcon meeting Demeter while walking in harsh midday-sun (cf. Theoc. 7.21 τὺ (: τὸ *v.l.*) μεσαμέριον πόδας ἕλκεις/), but the entry presents verbal similarities with Ant. Lib. 24, reflecting Nic. *Heter.* (fr. 56) καὶ αὐτὴν <*αὔην*> *ὑπὸ πολλοῦ καύματος* ὑποδέχεται Μίσμη καὶ διδοῖ ποτὸν ὕδωρ ἐμβαλοῦσα γλήχωνα καὶ ἄλφιτον εἰς αὐτό. καὶ ἡ Δημήτηρ ἐξέπιε *κατὰ τὸ δίψος* τὸ ποτὸν ἀθροῦν.

Suid. ι 107 ἰδίειν, referring to Call. *Hec.* fr. 46.3 εἴδεος ἐνδίοιο, may suggest that Salustius discussed this term in his commentary on *Hecale*.

μ 1294 μητροπόλους· τὰς πάλαι Μελίσσας.

Latte here referred to μ 719 μέλισσαι· αἱ τῆς Δήμητρος μύστιδες. μητροπόλος (a Pindaric rarity, '*tending mothers*' in *P.* 3.9 ματροπόλῳ σὺν Ἐλειθυίᾳ) may suggest a relation of immediate parentage (cf. *LSJ* s.v. μητρόπολις). If P. named his Coan Nymphs Melissai ὀροδεμνιάδες and accorded to them poetological duties with which they were able to teach their precepts in Theoc. 7.92 and in Call. fr. 1.11–2, he might have hinted at their parentage from the Heliconian Nymphs/Muses, i.e. τὰς πάλαι Μελίσσας, performing this didactic task in Hes. *Theog.* 22–3.[2] In broad lines, all Nymphs with a poetic tinge can be conceived as drawing their origin from Parnassus, but this assumption gains particular support by the invocation to the Castalian Nymphs in a firmly Coan environment in Theoc. 7.148 Νύμφαι Κασταλίδες Παρνάσιον αἶπος ἔχοισαι, side by side with their Coan counterparts appearing in 92 and 136–7. Cf. Posidippus' *SH* 705.1f. Μοῦσαι πολιήτιδες being taught Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος ἀνὰ πτύχ[α]ς and, further, the Cean Nymphs once expelled from Parnassus in Call. fr. 75.56–7. These πάλαι Μέλισσαι are perhaps to be identified as the daughters of the Heliconian king Melisseis,[3] who features in a recondite tradition referred to in Nic. *Ther.* 11–2 Ἀσκραῖος μυχάτοιο Μελισσήεντος ἐπ' ὄχθαις/Ἡσίοδος . . παρ' ὕδασι Περμησσοῖο, where Σ 11c (39.6 Crugnola) explain Μελισσήεντα δέ φησιν τὸν τόπον τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος, ἐν ᾧ εὗρε τὰς Μούσας, ὃς οὕτως ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ Μελισσέως βασιλεύσαντος τοῦ τόπου. Call. *Aet.* fr. 2.2 Ἡσιόδ̣ῳ Μουσέων ἑσμὸ̣ς ὅτ' ἠντίασεν may hint at this version.

ν 354 νεοστεφέος· νεοκράτου.

This was singled out as a verse citation by Hollis 1998, 68. νεοστεφής is a scholarly coinage glancing at the ancient dispute on Homeric (κρητῆρας)

---

[2] In a parallel way, P. might have hinted at Hymettus as the birth place of real bees, see p. 304.

[3] The name is typical of a king with daughters-Nymphs, cf. Melisseus in Crete in Theog. cycl. *Arg.* *PEG* p. 10, Melissos in Paros in Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F 89.

ἐπιστεφέας οἴνοιο/ 'filled to the brim' or 'crowned', see Erbse (I.131) on Σ *Il.* 1.470b. The comment νεοκράτου brings this lemma into association with Hsch. ε 5241 ἐπιστεφές· πλῆρες. κεκραμένον, ε 5239 ἐπιστέφει· κεραννύει (cf. υ 243 νειόφυρτον· νεόκρατον). This is a rare interpretation[4] which, to a Hellenistic scholar, may have been suggested by an approximation of *Il.* 1.470 κρητῆρας ἐπεστέψαντο with expressions such as *Od.* 3.393 κρητῆρα κεράσσατο and the like.

The term seems to refer to wine,[5] of which there may have been word at Chalcon's banquet in P. (cf. fr. 19). The mixing of wine in that scene is suggested by Theoc. 7.154–5 πῶμα διεκρανάσατε, Νύμφαι,/βμῷ πὰρ Δάματρος ἀλωίδος, even more so as it is employed with the poetological connotations known from Pindar, cf. also Dryas' dance in Long. 2.36 ἐῴκει . . . πληροῦντι τοὺς πίθους (see p. 211). In the explanation νεοκράτου there may also lurk a cultic hint, as the term is employed of wine used in a symposium for libations to the gods after the proper meal, see K-A on Plato Com. *PCG* 71.8, Erat. *apud* Athen. 11.482a. The conceivable reference to P. might have once stood in a more complete form of Σ Theoc. 3.21 (122.15 Wendel) τὸν στέφανον τῖλαι· . . . στεφάνοις γὰρ ἐχρῶντο ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης (*Symposium* fr. 101), εὐετηρίαν καὶ ἀφθονίαν αἰνιττόμενοι τροφῶν· στέψαι γὰρ τὸ πληρῶσαι, ὡς Ὅμηρος· [*Il.* 1.470]. The superstitious symbolism of the garland referred to in the Σ may favour the proposed ascription to the Coan. On the ancient habit of crowning the mixing bowl in a symposium see Arnott on Alexis *PCG* 124.5–6, of crowning the cups K-A on Ar. fr. 395.

---

[4] (ἐπι)στέφω = κεραννύω, other than here, only in Hsch. σ 1804 στέψαι· πληρῶσαι. στεφανῶσαι. κεράσαι. κυκλῶσαι, cf. Σ Theoc. *l.s.* Antim. fr. 25 πλῆσεν δ' ἄρ' ἐπιστέψασ<α> δέπαστρον makes a scholarly point on the same term.

[5] Hollis *l.c.* suggests νεοστεφέος <οἴνοιο/> by analogy with Nic. *Ther.* 591 παλαισταγέος οἴνοιο/, which is a rare rhythm in Callimachean terms, attested, though, in an elegiac hexameter in P. fr. 12.1.

APPENDIX II

A NEW EPIC FRAGMENT?

In Call. *HyDem.* 91–3 Erysichthon melts like snow on the mountains:

> ὡς δὲ Μίμαντι χιών, ὡς δ' ἀελίῳ ἔνι πλαγγών,
> καὶ τούτων ἔτι μέζον ἐτάκετο, μέστ' ἐπὶ νεύροις·
> δειλαίῳ ῥινός (ἶνες *v.l.*) τε καὶ ὀστέα μῶνον ἐλείφθη.

V. Langholf, *MHJ* 21 (1986), 10f. revealed a striking parallelism of these lines with Hippocr. *De flat.* 12.3 (V.1.120 Jouanna) καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ σάρκες ὑπάρχουσιν ἔτι αἱ τηξόμεναι· λείπεται γὰρ ὀστέα καὶ νεῦρα καὶ ἶνες (M, γράφεται καὶ ῥῖνες in marg.: ῥινὸς A) etc.[1] C. W. Müller, "Ein neues Epikerfragment" in W. Gorler – S. Koster (edd.), *Pratum Saraviense. Festgabe für P. Steinmetz*, Stuttgart 1990, 41–7 postulated a hexameter νεῦρά τέ οἱ ἶνές τε καὶ ὀστέα μοῦνον ἔλειφθεν as the common model of Hippocr. and Call., which he tentatively attributed to Hes. *Cat.* (this last suggestion seems unappealing to me). Employment of contemporary medical terminology would not be surprising in Call., but direct adaptation of a Hippocratic passage seems awkward. I might wonder whether P. mediated this Hippocratic passage to Call. He introduces scientific terminology into poetry and had a natural interest in medicine. Note in particular his adaptation of another Ps-Hippocratic passage noted in fr. 13.1e *ad fin.* Erysichthon is described as a child in Call. (cf. 47 (by Demeter) τέκνον πολύθεστε τοκεῦσι, 100 (by Triopas) τοῦτο τὸ δείλαιον . . βρέφος) and a seriously sick child may have featured in *Demeter*, to whom a reference of such content and of such derivation would be appropriate. That child might have later acquired a poetological symbolism, like the one embodied by Erysichthon. Certain other features in the description of Erysichthon may allude to scenes related to that Philitan child, such as 67 μεγάλᾳ δ' ἐστρεύγετο νούσῳ, 94 κλαῖε μὲν ἁ μάτηρ, βαρὺ δ' ἔστενον αἱ δύ' ἀδελφαί/χὼ μαστὸς τὸν ἔπωνε καὶ αἱ δέκα πολλάκι δῶλαι, cf. Ov. *F.* 4.537–8 (Demeter of Celeus' sick child) *limen ut intravit, luctus videt omnia plena:/iam spes in puero nulla salutis erat.* To that skin-and-bone child of P. Call. would contrast omnivorous Erysichthon. Subsequently, the origins of the double *v.l.* ῥινός/ἶνες (the first is probably the reading in Call., the second, despite Jouanna, in Hippocr. — and P.?) are perhaps to be sought in Coan (or Alexandrian, or both) quarters combining medical and literary interests.

---

[1] The dependence was contested by Nikitinski 142–5 with reference to the proverbial usage of ὀστία καὶ δέρμα in Greek (Gow on Theoc. 2.89).

APPENDIX III

A HYPOTHESIS ON *SOROS*

Demeter is never associated with poetry before Call. and Theoc. She assumes this role in *HyDem.*, in *HyAp.* 110–2 in alliance with Apollo, in *Aet.* fr. 1.10 and in Theoc. 7 (see N. Hopkinson, *CR* n.s. 38 (1988), 401). All these cases may constitute undisguised references to *Demeter* and the goddess' short career as a symbol of the new poetic creed may well be due to P. The possibility of her poetic capacity covering the *Soros* as well seems worth raising. This was an early collection of epigrams attested by Σ A (Did.) *Il.* 11.101a (III.144 Erbse) {αὐτὰρ ὁ} βῆ ῥ' Ἶσον {τε}: Ζηνόδοτος ἔξω τοῦ ρ̄ 'βῆ Ἶσον'. μὴ ἐμφέρεσθαι δέ φησιν ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος νῦν ἐν τοῖς Ποσειδίππου ἐπιγράμμασι τὸν 'Βήρισον', ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ Σωρῷ (*SH* 701) εὑρεῖν ἐξελεγχόμενον αὐτὸν ἀπαλεῖψαι. The content of *Soros* is unknown. Some[1] think that it was a collection of epigrams by Posidippus alone, but the affinities among Asclepiades, Posidippus and Hedylus (cf. Meleag. *HE* 1.45–6), boost the theory of Reitzenstein 1893, 96–102 that *Soros* was a collection containing epigrams of these three poets, cf. W. Peek, *RE* XXII.431, Cameron 1993, 369f. and E. Degani *DNP* I.735.

The title given to the collection has largely remained unaccountable. F. Lassere, *RhM* n.s. 102 (1959), 325f., on the basis of Theoc. 7.155–6 (Demeter) ἇς ἐπὶ σωρῷ/αὖτις ἐγὼ πάξαιμι μέγα πτύον and of occasional motifs in Theoc. 7, concluded that Theoc. systematically refers to *Soros.* Even if his conclusion is implausible (see Weingarth 39f.), his contribution is of importance as he first related the title of the collection to Demeter. Gutzwiller 1998, 155–6 showed that contributions variable in style and content could be accommodated under such a title *cll.* Demetr. *De interpr.* 1.12 ὥσπερ γὰρ σεσωρευμένοις ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις τὰ κῶλα ἔοικεν καὶ ἐπερριμμένοις καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν σύνδεσιν οὐδ' ἀντείρεισιν and Theoc. *HE* 17.7 σωρὸν ῥημάτων of a collection of Epicharmus' maxims. None of the proposals leaving Demeter out is nearly as convincing (summarised by Cameron 1993, 375). σωρός originally and most appropriately applies to a heap of corn, cf. Hes. *WD* 778 and see *LSJ* s.v. (1). Demeter herself is called in Orph. *Hy.* 40.5 σωρῖτις and in Adaeus *GPh* 2.5 πολύσωρος. Should this be so, Theoc. 7.155–6 is of immediate relevance. It would emerge that the publication of *Soros* antedates idyll 7.

---

[1] Knaack in Susemihl ii, 698, *HE* ii, 116, Dover on Theoc. 7.155, Fraser i, 560, Gutzwiller 1998, 18, 155. The latter points out the lack of multi-authored anthologies before Meleager, but see ff.

But why should a collection of epigrams be set under Demeter's auspices? And why should epigrams published elsewhere be unabridged here in a collection by the poets themselves? When their joint edition came out, they were apparently all still alive. Two of the three possible contributors lived in Samos, Asclepiades being the eldest and most highly reputed of all. The third, Posidippus, had strong ties with him and both with P. At the same time, the notion of 'poetic' Demeter seems to originate from and always refer to P. One is prompted to the assumption that *Soros* is somehow related to P. Could this be the first posthumous *Festschrift* ever published? Such a joint edition would not be unparalleled. L. Argentieri, *ZPE* 121 (1998), 9 pointed out that one such work is attested in a 3rd cent. BC London papyrus published as Adesp. Pap. Eleg. *SH* 961, which is apparently a prefatory elegy to a collection of epigrams written by poets of the Ptolemaic Court for an official occasion, perhaps the wedding of Ptolemy Philadelphus with Arsinoe II. Gutzwiller 1998, 20, discussing Meleager's presentation of his *Garland* to his friend Diocles (*HE* 1.3–4), noted that "the composition of one or more epigrams . . . as a gift for a friend was surely a widespread practice in antiquity". Comparable would be the *genethliakon* genre, with creations such as Call. *Iambi* 12 written for the seventh day celebration of Leon's (a γνώριμος of Call.) daughter, Antip. Thess. *GPh* 31 γενέθλιον . . βίβλον to Piso or the birthday-epigrams of Leon. Alex. *FGE* 1, 30, 32, see further Mineur 11f. From Posid. *SH* 700–1 and Asclep. *SH* 219 and *HE* 29, Bergk (*Poetae Lyrici Graeci* ii, Leipzig [4]1882, 342) conjectured that *Soros* contained many sepulchral epigrams on Iliadic heroes (see also Susemihl ii, 531 with n. 66, and Ll-J — Parsons on Posid. *SH* 700), which would be consistent with the conditions of its publication suggested here. Note, too, that Tibullus imitated motifs lurking in Theoc. 7 (p. 281 n. 122) in a poem celebrating the birthday of his friend Cornutus. In line with this, Theoc. would offer his seventh poem as his own honorary tribute, 7.155–6 (Δάματρος ἀλωίδος) ἇς *ἐπὶ σωρῷ*/αὖτις [not 'again' but 'in my turn'] ἐγὼ πάξαιμι μέγα [as opposed to the short epigram?] πτύον [a Homeric hapax, *Il.* 13.588; as the instrument used to winnow chaff from grain, it suggests a selection and recast of Philitan motifs].

INDEX IA

INDEX VERBORUM OF THE POETICAL FRAGMENTS

The references are to fragments and lines. Only words occurring in the genuine poetical fragments are included. The following signs are employed:

†	corrupt form transmitted in the MS(S)
corr.	certain emendation of the tradition
emend.	very likely emendation of the tradition
( )	forms not found in the fragments
< >	figures treated by P., but not attested in the text
[1]	the MS(S) also offer a similar form
[2]	the MS(S) also offer a completely different reading
[3]	absent in some MS(S)

ἀγαθή 5.1
ἄγουσιν (3rd plur. pres.) 17
ἀγροιώτης 25.1
ἀ<εί> 10.4, αἰεί 9.1, αἰέν 3.3
ἄεμμα 16
ἀέξεται 9.1
<Aeolus> 1
ἀθανάτους 2.2
Ἀθηναίης 21.1
Ἀίδαο 3.1[1]
αἰδώ 5
(αἱρέω) εἷλεν 12.2, αἱρήσει 25.2, ἑλοῦσα 27.1[1]
(αἴρω) αἰρόμενος 25.2
αἰψηρῶν 24.2[1]
ἄλγεα 13.1
<Alcinous> 22
ἀλλά 10.3, ἀλλ' 13.1, 25.3
ἄλλο 9.1, ἄλλα 10.4
ἀμφί 4.3
ἀνάγκη 2.1
ἀνδρός 2.1
ἀνέμων 24.2
ἀνῖαι 4.3
(ἀνύω) ἤνυσα 3.2
ἀπό 12.2, 27.2
(ἀπόλλυμι) ἀπό . . ὀλέσασα (tm.) 20.1[1]
(ἀποφέρω) ἀπό . . φέρει (tm.) 10.3
ἀποφώλιος 25.1
Ἀργανθώνιον 26

ἄστλιγγας (ἄστλιγξ) 11
ἄστυ 21.1
<Atalante> 27
ἀτραπόν 3.1
αὖ 23.4
αὐτάρ 16 (emend.)
αὐτός 19.2
(ἄχος) ἀχέων 2.3
Ἄχναι 28

βουγενέας 14.1
†Βουρρίνης (vel -ίννης) 6
Βυρίνης 6 (corr.)

(γαῖα) †γαίῃ 8, γαίης 10.1, γαῖαν 24.1
γαληναίῃ 4.2
γάρ 2.1, 19.1[3], 12.1, 23.3
γε 20
γηρύσαιτο 20.1
(γιγνώσκω) ἔγνως 23.3
γίνεται 9.2
γραίῃ 8 (corr.)
γυμνόν 16

†δάσαντο 6
δέ 4.3, 20.1, 8, δ' 5[1], 6, 9.1 (bis), 9.2, 23.2, 23.4, νῦν δέ 24.2
δειλαίων 12.2
<Demeter> 5α–21 passim

(δέμω) δείματο 19.2
(δή) ἦ μὲν δή 4.1
(δίδωμι) δῶκεν 28.2
<Diores> 1
Διωνύσου 19.1[1], 27.2[1] (corr.)
δμωίδες 17
δολιχαόρου 21.1

(ἐγώ) μοί 10.1, μέ 23.1 (corr.), 25.1, σοί 23.4, τοί 9.3, σέ 23.3, οἱ (m.) 27.1
(εἰμί) ἐστί 19.1, ἐόντος (m.) 23.2
εἰς 3.1, 17
ἐκ 10.2, 13.1, 23.1, ἐξ 25.1
ἔκτοσθεν 2.3
(ἐκφεύγω) ἐξέφυγεν 18
Ἐλευ]σῖνος 21.2
ἔμπεδ' 10.4 (adv.)
ἐν 2.2, 6
ἐναντίον 3.2
(ἐπέρχομαι) ἐπὶ . . ἔλθῃ (tm.) 13.1
ἐπί 5
ἐπιμίσγεαι 4.2
(ἐπίσταμαι) ἐπιστάμενος 25.4
(ἔπος) ἐπέων 25.3
ἔρι 17
<Hermes> 1
(ἔρχομαι) ἦλθεν 3.2, ἐρχομένων 10.2 (corr.)
ἔσχατος 18
(ἔχω) ἔχει 13.2, †ἔσχομεν ὧν 10.2

(Ζεύς) Διός 10.2, 13.1
ζωήν 20.1[2]

(ἦ) ἦ μὲν δή 4.1
ἠδέ 10.1 (corr.)
ἤθεσιν 5
<Herarcles> 16?
ἡσυχίῃ 9.2

θαλάσσης 10.1
θεῖον 21.2
θεός 23.4, θεοί 24.1
Θεσμοφόρος? 5α
Θεσσαλαί 15 (corr.)
θρήσσασθαι 8
(θυμός) θυμοῦ 23.1, θυμέ 4.2

<Jason> 22
ἱερόν 21.1
<Hippomenes> 27
ἰσχυρά 2.1
ἰχθύς 18

καί 10.4, 12.1, 13.2, 21.1, 21.2, 23.1, 25.3
(κακός) κακοῦ 9.2 (n., subst.), κακῶν 10.3 (n., subst.), 23.4 (n., subst.)
κάκτου 20.2
(καλός) καλά 23.4 (n.)
(κάμνω) ἐκάμοντο 2.3
κέν 21.1, κε[ν 21.2
κήδεα 12.2
κλαίω 23.3, κλαῦσαι 23.1
κλαυθμοῖο 12.1
κλῆθρην 25.2
κορεσσάμενος 12.1 (corr.)
<Cos (insula)> 5α–21 passim
κόσμον 25.3
κροτάφων 27.2
Κύπρις 27.1

(λαγχάνω) ἔλλαχε 13.2
†λαιψηρόν 24.2
(λέγω) εἰπεῖν 23.2
λευκολόφος 19.2
λευκόν 17 (n.)
λό]φον 21.2

μακέλην 25.2
μακρά 14 (adv.)
†μέγα 23.1
<Medea> 22
μελαμπέτροιο 6 (corr.)
(μέλεος) μελέοιο 12.1, μελέῳ 10.3
Μελιγουνίς? 1α
μελίσσας 14
μέν 26.1, ἦ μὲν δή 4.1
μένουσιν 10.3 (corr.)
μέτρια (adv.) 23.1
μῆλα ('pomes') 27.2
(μιμνήσκω) μεμνῆσθαι 23.2
(μογέω) μογήσας 25.3
Μοῖρα 10.3
μοῖραν 23.4
μοῦνος 13.2, μοῦνον 24.2 (n.)
(μῦθος) μύθων 25.4

νάσσατο 6 (corr.)
νεβρός 20.1[2]
†νεκρός 20.1
(νέμω) †νέμει 23.4, ἔνειμε 23.4 (corr.)
(νέος) νέαι 4.3
νεῶρες 9.1
νῆσος? 1α
νήχυτον 7
νῦν 9, νῦν δέ 24.1

(ξεῖνος) ξείνων 23.3

(ὁ, ἡ, τό) †τοῦ 19.1 (art., m.), τήν 3.2 (rel.), τό 9.1 (art., nom.), τά 23.1 (corr., art., acc.), τά 27.1 (dem., acc.) τοῖς 10.4 (dem., n.)
ὁδίτης 3.2
<Odysseus> 1
(οἶδα) εἰδώς 25.3
οἴκους 2.3
οἶμον 25.4
Ὀλύμπῳ 2.2
ὄμπνια? 5α
ὁμῶς 23.2
ὀξείης 20.2
(ὁράω) ὁρᾶν 24.2, ἴδοι[μι 21.2
(ὄρος) ὀρέων 24.2
(ὅς, ἥ, ὅ) ὅς 13.1, ὅ 16 (emend., m.), οἱ 2.2, ἥ 2.2, ἥν 19.2, †ὧν 10.2
ὅσον 4.2
ὅσσον 4.2
(ὅτε) ὅτ' 13.1
οὐ 10.1, 23.3, 25.1
(οὐδέ) οὐδ' 2.2, 4.2, 10.3, 20, †οὐδέ 10.1
οὐκέτ' 23.2

παντοίων 25.4 (m.)
πάρεστιν 24.1
(πένθος) πενθέων 13.2
πέσσω 9.1, πέσσειν 13.1
πῆμα 9.2
πλατάνῳ 8
πόλις 19.1
(πολύς) πολέων 10.1 (n.), πολέεσσι 4.1 (n.), πολλά 23.3 (n., acc.), 25.3 (n., acc.)
<Polymele> 1
ποτέ 24.1, 27.1
πραπίδων 12.2
προσαυξάνεται 10.4
(προσβαίνω) προσεβήσαο 14
προσηνές 23.1
προχοῇσι 6

(ῥά) ῥ' 2.2

†σελαμπέτροιο 6

ταλάρους 17
(τε) τ' 2.2
<'Telephus'>? 22
τέμενος 24.2
τετρήχασιν 4.3
(τίς, τί, rel.) τίς 3.2 (m.), 12.1 (m.), 25.1 (m.), τί 23.1
τύμμα 20.2
τῷ 10.1

ὕδωρ 7
υἱός 19.1
ὕκης 18 (corr.)
ὕπερ 10.1
ὕπο 8
ὑποδείδιεν 2.2

(φαίνω) φανέουσι 24.1
φάρμακα 13.2
(φέρω) †φέρουσιν 10.3
(φημί) †φάμενος 14
(φθάνω) φθάμενος 14 (corr.)
φίλος 19.1, φιλαίτατε 23.3
Φλιοῦς 19.1, 19.2
(φυλάττω) φυλαξαμένη 20.2
(φύρω) πεφύρησαι 4.1

(χαλεπός) χαλεπῶν 2.3 (n.), χαλεποῖσι (n.) 4.1 (corr.)
<Chalcon> 5α–21 passim
χρόνος 13.1

ψυχήν 20.1[2]

ὡραίων 10.2

INDEX IB

INDEX VERBORUM OF THE GRAMMATICAL FRAGMENTS

ἄμαλλαι 46
ἀμόραι 36
ἄμφωξις 29
ἀχαιαί 45
ἄωτον 30

βαῖβυξ 47

γυάλα 31

δῖνος 32

ἔλινος 43
ἐπινεύσομαι (*Il.* 1.524) 54

ἰάκχα 40
ἰδὼν (*Il.* 2.269) 56
ἴσθμιον 41

κρήιον 37
κύπελλα 38

μέγα (*Il.* 2.111) 55
μελαγκράνινος 53

οἴματ'/ὄμματ' (*Il.* 21.152) 58
ὄμπνιος 44

πέλλα 33
πρόξ 21
προχύτης 34

σκάλλιον 35
σκῖρος 49
σκύζη 50
σποδεύς 39

ὑπ' αὐνήν† 51
ὑπεζῶσθαι 52
ὑποθυμίς 42

φρῖχ' ὑπαλύξει (*Il.* 21.126) 30

INDEX IIA

INDEX FONTIUM OF THE POETICAL FRAGMENTS

Sources which do not mention P. by name are prefixed by an asterisk *.

Antig. Car.
Mir. 8: 20
ibid. 19: 14

Apollod. Athen.: v. POxy. 2260.i.1

Athen.
2.71a: 20
5.192e: 8
7.327c: 18

[Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.10 + Σ Flor. ad loc.: 5a]

Choerob. ad Theod.
I.333.10 H.: 5

EtG
s.v. Ἀργανθώνιον: 26
s.v. νῆ: 7

EtM
s.v. Ἀργανθών: 26
*s.v. ἄστλιγγας: 11
s.v. νῆ: 7

Eustath.
Comm. Od. 1482.37: 8

Herodian
I.44.4 L.: 11
II.763.20 L.: 5

Hsch.
*s.v. ἄεμμα: 16
*s.v. ἄστλιγγας: 11
s.v. Θεσσαλαί: 15
*s.v. κάκτος: v. Antig. Car. *Mir.* 8
*s.v. νήχυτον: 7

Parth.
Erot. path. 2: 1
[*ibid.*: 1a]

POxy. 2258A fr. 2 verso (marg. Σ Call. *HyAp.* 33): 16
2260.i.1: 21

Σ A.R.
1.1297: 11
4.1141: 22

Σ Call.: v. POxy. 2258A

Σ Hom.
T on *Il.* 14.385b: 21.1
ibid. on *Il.* 21.179b: 21.1

Σ Theoc.
2.120b: 27
*4.57b: 20
7.6: 6

Steph. Byz.
s.v. Ἴχναι: 28
s.v. Φλιοῦς: 19

Stobaeus
1.4.4: 2
2.4.5: 25
4.17.15: 24
4.40.11: 9
4.40.12: 4
4.40.15: 10
4.51.3: 3
4.56.10: 23.1–2
4.56.11: 23.3–4
4.56.26: 13
4.56.26a: 12

Strabo
8.5.3: 17

*Suid.
s.v. νῆ: 7

INDEX IIB

INDEX FONTIUM OF THE GRAMMATICAL FRAGMENTS

Sources which do not mention P. by name are prefixed by an asterisk *.

Athen.
3.114e: 39
11.467c: 31
11.467f: 32
11.483a: 38
11.498a: 35
11.495e: 33
11.496c: 34
11.783a: 30
11.783d: 29
14.645d: 37
14.646d: 36
15.677c: 41
15.678a: 40
15.678d: 42

*Choerob. ad Theod.
I.80.18 H.: 47

EtG
*s.v. ἀμαλλοδετῆρες: 46
s.v. ἐλινός: 43
s.v. πρόκας: 48

EtGud. auct. s.v. Ἀχαιά: 45

EtM
*s.v. ἀμαλλοδετῆρες: 46
*s.v. ἄμφωξις: 29
s.v. ἐλινός: 43
s.v. Προικόννησος: 48
[*ibid.* cod. M: All. Gramm. Ascr. Spur. 1]

EtSym.
*s.v. ἀμαλλοδετῆρες: 46

Eustath.
Comm. Il. 1235.39: 58
**ibid.* 1207.9: v. Athen. 11.467f
**Comm. Od.* 1429.21: v. Athen. 11.783a
**ibid.* 1624.30: v. Athen. 11.783d

*Gloss. interl.
(A) *Il.* 2.269: 56
gloss. marg. Strabo 3.5.1: 53

*Herodian
II.741.37 L.: 47

Hsch.
s.v. ἄμαλλαι: 46
*s.v. ἄμφωξις: 29
*s.v. Ἀχαία: 45
*s.v. ἀχιά: 45
*s.v. ἄωτοι: 30
s.v. βαίβυκος: 47
*s.v. ἐλινοί: 43
*s.v. θιάκχα: 40
*s.v. ἰάκχα: 40
*s.v. σκαλλίον: 35
s.v. σκεῖρος: 49
s.v σκύζης: 50
s.v. ὑπ' αὐνῆν†: 51
s.v. ὑπεζῶσθαι: 52

Orion Paris.
s.v. Ἀχαιά: 45

Porphyry
Quaest. Hom. 1.45.13 S.: 57

*POxy. 221.iv.26 (Σ Hom. *Il.* 21.126): 57

Σ A.R.
2.279a: 48
4.989i: 44

Σ A Hom.
Il. 1.524c: 54
2.111b: 55
2.269c: 56
6.459: 57
8.171a: 57
21.126–7a: 57

ibid. (bT) c: 57
22.308a[1]: 58
**ibid.* a[2]: 58

*Σ Nic.
Alex. 181f: 43

*Σ Theoc.
10.44a: 46

[Strabo]
v. gloss. marg. Strabo

*Suidas
s.v. ἄωτον: 30

'Zonaras'
Lex. s.v. πρόκας: 48

INDEX IIC

INDEX FONTIUM OF THE TESTIMONIA

Ael.
VH 9.14: 22c
10.6: 22b

Anecd. Estense
iii, 9.10 W.: 14

Antig. Car. *Mir.*
19: 9 (fr. 18)

Athen.
9.401e: 21
12.552b: 22a

Call.
fr. 532: 6
Aet. fr. 1.10: 7a (fr. 5a)

Canones Byz., Poet. Eleg.: 18b

Choerob. ad Theod.
I.338.10 H.: 26

Crates Epigr.
AP 11.218: 8

Hermesian.
Leontion CA 7.75–8: 2

Ovid
Ars am. 3.329: 24a
Rem. am. 760: 24b
Tristia 1.6.2: 24c
Ex Ponto 3.1.58: 24d

POxy. 2064 (Σ marg. Theoc. 7.40): 12a

Phot.
Bibl. 114b20, 319b13: 18a

Plut.
An seni sit ger. respub. 791e: 20

Posid. Epigr. PMil. Vogl. 309, inv. 1295.x.16–25: 3

Proclus
Chrest. 27: v. Phot.

Prop.
2.1.5–6: 23a
2.34.31: 23b
3.1.1: 23c
3.3.52: 23d
3.9.44: 23e
4.5.57: 23a
4.6.3: 23f

Quint.
10.1.58: 19

Σ Flor. Call.
Aet. fr. 1.10: 7b

Σ A Hom.
Il. 1.524c: 10 (fr. 54)
2.111b: 10 (fr. 55)

Σ Nic.
Ther. 3: 16

Σ Theoc.
7.5–9k, o: 13 (fr. 6)
7.40f, g: 12b
v. POxy. 2064.

Statius
Silv. 1.2.252: 25

Strabo
14.2.19: 11

Strato Com.
Phoenikides PCG 1.43: 4

Suidas
s.v. Ζηνόδοτος: 15
s.v. Φιλητᾶς: 1

Theoc.
7.40: 5

Tzetzes
Schol. Lyc., 3.16 Scheer: 18c
Exeg. Il. 126.9 Herm.: 27

Vitae Arati
ii 11.6 M., iv 19.8 M.: 17

Vita Theoc.
1.9 W.: 14

'Zonaras'
Lex. s.v. Ζηνόδοτος: 15

III. INDEX OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

Passages included in the *Index Fontium* are normally omitted.

Aelian
VH 7.7a: 69n.85
10.6: 54
14.46b: 96

Aesch. *Frag. TrGF*
273f.: 112

Alcaeus (Voigt)
307c: 269

Alciphro
Epist. 4.13: 64n.77
4.13.2: 227, 251
4.13.4: 247
4.13.6: 256
4.13.10: 283
4.13.11: 211

Alcman *PMGF*
16: 318f.
56.3f.: 356

Alexander Aet. *CA*
3.11f.: 138
5.4: 51
7.1: 245n.92
[22]: see *Alexander Com.*

Alexander Com. *PCG*
Dub. 4: 361

Anacreon
IEG 2: 314
PMG 433.1f.: 209n.56

Androm. *GDRK*
62.169f.: 149f.

Anonyma
AP 16.265.9: 249
CA 4: 117n.20
5: 337
FGE 134: 55, 69, 340
GDRK 53.9f.: 150
63.26f.: 114
IEG 21: 180
orac. *ap.* Hdt. 8.77.1: 218
PCG 537: 362
1146.37: 402
PMG 997: 360
POxy. 2260i.29f.: 28f., 215f., 392
3723: 341f.
SH 903A: 238
939.19f.: 329
961: 410
962: 343
964.15f.: 138f.
983: 335f.
990.2: 180, 181n.27
991: 402f.
993.6f.: 308
1048: 344f.
1083: 405f.
See *Call.* Inc. Auct.

Antig. Car.
Mir. 8: 212
19: 184

Antim. (Matthews)
Lyde 78–9: 46
85: 46
Theb. 25: 407n.4
Dub. 192: 201n.53
197: 44

Antip. Sid. *HE*
66: 62n.73, 68n.84

Antip. Thess. *GPh*
20.2–4: 12
97.3: 337

Anyte *HE*
18: 291n.131

Apollod. Ath. *FGrH*
244 F 89: 195, 267, 406n.3
244 F 102a, f: 108n.10
244 F 110: 276f.
244 F 157: 95n.1
244 F 265: 360

Apoll. Rhod.
1.142f.: 208
1.278f.: 300
1.282f.: 159, 284, 300
1.896: 315
1.1296f.: 171
2.137: 160
2.240f.: 175
2.279: 374
2.505: 330
2.677: 171n.22
2.754: 96
2.820f.: 110
3.428f.: 107
3.530: 154f.
3.658f.: 119
3.772f.: 168
3.928: 247
4.351f.: 121
4.447: 121
4.566f.: 205f.
4.982f.: 301
4.989: 301, 370
4.993: 117
4.1110, 1142f.: 311n.4
4.1146, 1161f.: 309
4.1245f., 1256f.: 317
4.1393f.: 301f.
4.1403f.: 302
4.1450f.: 302
4.1452f.: 39, 303n.143
4.1773f.: 39
See Σ *A.R.*

Aratus
267: 379
276: 121
373: 166
529: 218

Archil. *IEG*
128.1: 117
196a.26f.: 260
280: 374

Ar. *Frag. PCG*
156: 54
232: 324
233: 385

Aristotle
EN 1126a22f.: 179
HA 520a6f.: 383
551b16: 267
572b24f.: 376
596b15f.: 231
Poet. 1452b2: 325
1461a9f.: 387
fr. 3 Kassel: 120
[*Phys.*] 807b29: 125n.27
Rhet. 1414a6: 207
Fragments (Rose)
98: 125n.27
101: 407
511: 39

Asclep. *HE*
2.3: 45
4.1: 34
10.2: 144
17.3f.: 260
19.1f.: 50n.51
19.4: 316
32: 62n.73, 320
33.5f.: 316
36.1f.: 299
[45].1f.: 250n.96, 251

Asclep. Myrl. *FGrH*
697 F 2: 329

Athenaeus
7.327af.: 199
13.597af.: 33
14.622c: 365

Bacchylides
5.50f.: 316

Batrachomyomachia
39: 362

Bion (Gow)
fr. 13.7f.: 65

Callimachus
Aetia Fragments (Pf.)
1.2: 63
1.3–5: 43
1.5f.: 263
1.10: 13, 32n.24, 43f., 142f., 238, 321
1.11f.: 44, 266
1.13–6: 13
1.19f.: 38, 252
1.25–8: 38
1.27f.: 229, 269
1.28: 149
1.36: 176
1.37f.: 250
1.39f.: 278

2a: 47, 229n.75
2.1f.: 47, 148, 227, 406
7.11f.: 47f., 169, 282
7.13f.: 39
7.24: 62
21.11: 182
33: 263
110.52: 335
178.1f.: 193
186.27: 372
SH 254.4: 185
Other Fragments (Pf.)
384.35: 218
399: see *Epigr.* HE *68*
412: 331
474: 209f.
509: 201
532: 48f., 267
574: 306
Κτίσεις νήσων etc.: 106
SH 308: 138
Epigrams HE
2.4: 299
65a, b: 198f.
68: 357
Hecale Fragments (Hollis)
7: 124
10.1: 359
11: 155
74.5: 282
HyDel.
156: 312
HyAp.
1f.: 274
3: 275
6f.: 276f.
9f.: 228, 277
16: 278
18f.: 278
20f.: 278f.
22f.: 179, 279
33: 280
37: 177, 280
38f.: 280f.
41: 282f.
42f.: 283
47f.: 283f.
53: 284
56f.: 285
57: 246
80f.: 285f.
85f.: 288, 378
90f.: 288
105f.: 229f.
106: 289
108–12: 12, 231, 262, 289f., 291f.
113: 40
HyArt.
10: 190
47f.: 105f.
154: 374
244f.: 212
HyDem.
7f.: 293
17: 173
19: 295
24: 176
24f.: 295f.
27f.: 246, 259
34: 176
37f.: 265
42f.: 296
44: 227
91f.: 253, 299, 408
94: 270
114f.: 299
HyPal.
91f.: 374
131f.: 379
Iambi (Pf.)
191.42: 103
194: 321n.110
Inc. auct. (Pf.)
739: 345
786: 144
See Σ *Call.*

Catullus
1.1f.: 290
14.20f.: 275, 276
95.9f.: 13f.

Claudian
RP 1.30f.: 321n.10
1.123f.: 284
1.190f.: 173
1.217f.: 167
2.204f.: 178

Crates *HE*
1: 22f.

Cratinus Com. *PCG*
491: 375

Crinagoras *GPh*
51.1f.: 39

Demetrius
De eloc. 61: 207
156: 124n.26

Democr. D-K 68
B 20a: 385

Dictys Cret.
6.5: 111

Diodorus poeta *FGrH*
452 (*SH* 381): 331

Diodorus Sic.
5.4.6: 236
5.61: 297
5.81: 252
16.79.3: 257

Diog. Laert.
7.169: 324

Dionysius Sin. *PCG*
5.1f.: 358

Empedocles D–K 31
B 61.2: 185

Ennius
Var. 15f. Vahlen: 37
Epigr. 46 Courtney: 315

Epicharmus *PCG*
46: 362
66: 107, 135
158: 214

Erat. *CA*
11: 345
17: 124
22: 178
28: 369

Erycius *GPh*
1.1f.: 16

Eubulus *PCG*
104.1f.: 368

Euphorion
CA 9.5: 218
21: 313, 314
51.8f.: 106
74–5: 329f., 345
102: 279
127: 402
SH 415.i.20: 121
415.i.22: 219n.64
429.46f. (*CA* 130): 343

Eupolis *PCG*
299: 375

Euripides
Aeolus Fragments (Kannicht)
13af.: 129f.
31: 104
35: 159
Aeolus hypoth. (Austin)
22: 96
27f.: 104
33f.: 101
Hel.
1335f.: 150
1339f.: 210
IA
1051f.: 358
Tro.
433f.: 111

Eustathius *Comm. Il.*
723.43f.: 376

Heraclides Pont. (Wehrli)
Περὶ νήσων frr. 125f.: 106

Hermesianax *CA*
7.35f.: 44
7.63f.: 198n.48
7.75f.: 30f., 33f., 157
7.77: 68, 385, 392
7.93f.: 33
9: 30n.19

Hermippus Smyr. *FGrH*
1026 F 55: 199

Herodotus
1.10.2: 97
1.30.2: 104
1.88.1: 98
1.111.1: 99
7.123.3: 333f.

Herodas
2.97: 238
4.1f.: 149f.
5.30f.: 103

8: 17
8.37: 137n.44

Hesiod
WD 317: 125
369: 124
Theog. 913f.: 178
Cat. Fragments (M–W)
43a.2f.: 297
43a.66f.: 216
150.30f.: 127

Hesychius
ἀγροτέραν: 336
ἄεμμα: 189f.
ἀμόρα: 362
ἄμφωτις: 356
ἄμωρος: 362
ἀποβράσματα: 364
ἄστλιγγας: 171
ἀφεψάλου: 336
βουγενέων: 185
γαμήλια: 365
εἴδεος: 406
ἐμπεδὴς <δὲ> γαμόρος etc.: 168
ἐπικρήναια: 150
ἐπτάενον: 263
ἑρμή: 132
ἕτερον πόδα: 275f.
εὐάνασσα: 308
Εὐδωσώ: 336
ἠλίνδησε: 103
Θεσσαλαί: 189
θώρηκος γύαλον: 358f.
ἰακχάζει: 365
ἰανοκρήδεμνος: 405
ἴθμιον: 367
Ἰχναίην χώραν: 333
κάκτος: 212
κάπρα: 376
κατὰ δίψιον εἶδος: see *Anon.* SH *1083*
κλῇιδες: 227, 296
κνύζα: 256
κόρυμβος: 62
μελάγκρανις: 378
Μελιγουνίς: 58n.66
μέροπες: 401
μήκωνες: 306
μητροπόλους: 268, 406
νεοστεφέος: 406f.
νήχυτον: 154
ὀλόσχοινος: 378n.37
ὅμουρα: 362
ὄμπνιος: 370
ὀροδεμνιάδες: 261f.
προχύτης: 361
σκ{ε}ῖρα: 375
σκύζης: 340f., 376
τρύγα: 254
ὕκος: 199
ὑπ' αὐλήν: 377
ὕπαρνος ποίμνη: 284f.
ὑποθυμίς: 368

Hippocrates
Acut. 42.1: 180
Aph. 1.3: 17f.
De flat. 12.3: 299, 408

Hipponax *IEG*
6: 260
169: 201

Homer
Il. 4.171: 405
4.334f. (πολύστ.): 114
8.482f.: 376
9.18: 380
10.548f.: 118
15.71: 99
16.641f.: 360
18.553f.: 371
18.567f.: 193
20.248f.: 326
23.332f.: 374f.
24.349f.: 134
24.505: 114
24.513f.: 172f.
24.639: 159
24.717: 175
Od. 1.1: 109
5.388f.: 402
6.59: 337
6.169f.: 115
6.287f.: 119
7.118: 159f., 286
10.14f.: 98
10.16: 131
10.19f.: 101
10.490f.: 112
10.499: 103
10.502: 114
11.482: 122
11.606f.: 190
12.403f.: 317
13.102f.: 231
13.105f.: 268
13.107f.: 266
14.7f.: 208

14.301f.: 317
17.205f.: 149, 231f.
17.212: 249
17.295: 373f.
17.347: 125
18.300: 366f.
19.205f.: 253
22.347f.: 326

Horace
Ars poet. 272f.: 323
C. 1.7.5: 219
1.28.1: 219n.64
3.3.4f.: 318
Epist. 1.2.18f.: 97
1.19.23: 64
Sat. 1.10.34: 321n.10

Hyginus
Astr. 2.14.3: 298
Fab. 9.2: 279

Hymni Homerici
HHD 2f.: 178
40f.: 170
42: 227
48: 296
98f.: 155f.
141f.: 217f.
169f.: 194
188: 275
191f.: 195, 196
198f.: 209f.
206f.: 204
216f.: 177
228f.: 236, 237
238: 237
277f.: 169, 281
318: 221
480f.: 277
HHyAp. 42: 402

Ilias Parva EGF
6.2: 247

Inscriptions
BCH 78 (1954), 98: 20
CEG 685: 33
GVI 706.10, 1249.15f., 2078.1f.: 112f.
Hallof-Habicht 105f.: 188
Herzog, *PhW* 52 (1932), 1013f.: 235n.81
HG 1i.60f.: see *LSCG* 151A.60f.
1ii.23f.: see *LSCG* 151B.23f.
8iii.b.25f.: 290
8A.ii: 211, 241
10.42f.: see *IdC* ED 149.42f.
IdC ED 48: 188n.38
149.42f.: 200
178.4: 19
259: 153
EV 224: 192
361: 219
LSAM 61.6f.: 194
LSCG 65.22: 170
68.9f.: 170
68.17f.: 197
151A.60f.: 204
151B.23f.: 290n.129
P–H 10b.54: see *IdC* ED 178.4
Salmakis epigr. 1f.: 121
16: 151
43–56: 35n.31
SEG 4.47: 376
15.517.30f.: 250
36.975: 35n.31
Tab. Heracl. 62.19 Schwy.: 375

Ion Eleg. *IEG*
27.2f.: 361

Istrus *FGrH*
334 F 62: 372

Lasus Herm. *PMG*
702: 225

Leon. Tar. *HE*
3.1f.: 291
37.6: 364
74.5f.: 114

Longus
1.4: 265, 266
1.4.3: 264n.110, 267
2.3.1: 16, 227
2.3.2: 60, 265, 277
2.3.3: 254, 286
2.3.4: 204, 255, 260, 306
2.3.5: 156, 230, 247 bis, 263n.109, 270
2.4.1: 169, 249, 250, 281
2.4.3: 249, 251
2.4.4: 249, 250, 330
2.5.1: 250
2.5.5: 277
2.7: 65
2.7.4f.: 265
2.7.6: 16

2.7.7: 15
2.15.1: 65
2.17.1: 265
2.23: 266
2.32.1: 61, 227
2.32.7: 16
2.34: 15
2.35–6: 15, 211
2.35.2: 213
3.5.4: 16
3.27.2: 266
4.38.1f.: 256

Lycophron
245f.: 148
620f.: 165
648f.: 111
666f., 678f., 813f.: 138
708: 360
1393f.: 297
TGrF 100 F 1a: 138

Macareus *FGrH*
456 F 1b: 338

[Manetho]
Apot. 1.8: 325

Marsyas *FGrH*
135 F 21: 358

Meleager *HE*
3.3: 27n.15
13.7f.: 157

Menander
Dysc. 766: 324

Mimnermus *IEG*
1.1: 45
1.7: 121
1.10: 316
11.1: 45

Moschio Trag. *TrGF*
97 F 2: 134n.2
97 F 4.3: 219

Moschus
EB 92: 17
Eur. 131f.: 317
[*Megara*] 46: 164

Neopt. Par. *CA*
1: 333

Glossai (Mette)
10.9: 356

Nicetas Choniates
Hist. 491.3f. van Dieten: 17f.

Nicander
Alex. 126: 214
131: 307
181: 368
232f.: 286
324: 374
433f.: 306
445f.: 303
587: 155
Ther. 11f.: 268, 406
33: 303
70f.: 257
484f.: 237
577f.: 374
666f. : 271
758: 396
FGrH 271–2 F 10: 29
Fragments (Schneider)
56: 224, 238, 253f., 307
74.24: 247
94: 304
See Σ *Nic.*

Nonnus
D. 1.16f.: 121
6.6f.: 170
6.8f.: 173
6.24f.: 210
6.31f.: 284
6.44: 61
6.50f.: 172
6.133: 267
12.299f.: 369
13.188f.: 194
19.122: 263
38.43: 125
41.66f.: 208
47.50: 370
48.180f.: 332

[Oppian]
Cyn. 1.20f.: 114

Orph. *Arg.*
196: 209

Ovid
Am. 3.1.1f.: 228
3.1.3: 267, 291

3.1.4: 269, 270
3.1.5f.: 230, 247
3.1.7f.: 169, 275, 281
3.1.9: 228
3.1.33: 250
3.1.34: 249
Ex Pont. 3.1.57f.: 34, 39, 46
Fasti 3.177f.: 63
4.417f.: 223
4.493f.: 296
4.521f.: 173
4.531f.: 271, 306
4.535f.: 294
4.537f.: 237, 408
4.545: 283
4.545f.: 182
4.547f.: 306
4.616: 61
5.359: 169
5.376f.: 39
Her. 11.15, 73f.: 104
11.98: 140n.48
Met. 5.341f.: 223
5.440f.: 294
5.446f.: 307
5.447f.: 276
5.472f.: 170
7.363f.: 30
Trist. 1.6f.: 34

Pamprepius (Livrea)
3.120: 296

Parthenius
Erot. path. 3.1: 105

Paulus
Epist. Cor. 1.9.16: 109

Phaenias (Wehrli)
38: 214
50: 369n.21

Philicus *SH*
680.7: 228
680.38: 171
680.39f.: 307f.
680.40: 173
680.50: 296

[Philitas] *CA*
17: 336f.
25: see *Phylarchus*
26: see *Anon.* SH *1048*
27: 343f.

Philitas Sam. *HE*
1, 2: 339f.

Philoxenus *PMG*
815f.: 53

Philoxenus Gramm. (Theodoridis)
3: 381

Philteas *FGrH*
498: 14

Phoronis EGF
5: 218

[Phocylides]
Gn. 158: 324

Phylarchus *SH*
694A: 338f.

Pindar
O. 1.55f.: 179
P. 4.124f.: 96
4.247f.: 39
4.251f.: 118, 119
Fragments (Maehler)
37: 143, 225
52h.10f.: 38
104b: see *Anon.* PMG *997*
158: 181

Plato
Phdr. 229af.: 155, 230
258ef.: 269

Plutarch
Aet. gr. 304d: 263
An seni etc. 791e: 54f.
Is. et Os. 378d: 156
Per. 2.1: 14

Pollianus *AP*
11.130: 251

Posidippus
HE 9.1f.: 44
24.1f.: 62n.73
SH 701: 409f.
705.14f.: 40
705.16f.: 35
705.22f.: 38
T. 3: 24, 40, 43, 62, 64, 69

POxy.: see *Anonyma*

Praxilla *PMG*
747.3: 259

Praxiphanes (Wehrli)
21: 391

Propertius
1.1.15f.: 332
2.1.4f.: 49n.47, 267
2.12: 15
2.34.27f.: 33
2.34.31: 60n.70, 61n.71, 62f., 238
2.34.45f.: 33
3.1.1f.: 59
3.1.2f.: 60
3.1.3: 60f., 277
3.1.5: 266
3.1.6: 229n.75, 248, 275, 293
3.1.8: 290
3.1.9–12: 38f.
3.1.12: 39, 303n.143
3.1.21f.: 38
3.3: 60f.
3.3.1: 155, 227
3.3.13f., 25f.: 249
3.3.15: 229
3.3.17f.: 38
3.3.25f.: 229
3.3.27f.: 267, 290f.
3.3.37f.: 266
3.3.51f.: 248, 293
3.9.44: 63n.75
3.9.46: 37, 38
3.16.13f.: 16
3.34.35f.: 15
4.1.63f.: 39
4.6.1f.: 15, 37, 63
4.6.3: 63

Ptolemy, king of Egypt *SH*
712: 27

Quintilianus
10.158: 49, 57f.

Quint. Smyr.
3.521: 175
3.649f.: 107
14.466f.: 141

Rhianus *CA*
25: 106

Salmakis epigram: see *Inscriptions* s.v.

Sappho (Voigt)
57: 323

Σ A.R.
1.115: 202
1.1178: 329
4.1087–95: 104

Σ Call.
HyAp. 33 ap. POxy. 2258a.ii verso: 190, 191f.
HyDel. 165: 27n.15

Σ Hom.
Od. 1.136: 361
10.277: 132n.37
Il. 24.293a[1]: 239

Σ Luc.
Dial. mer. 2.1: 182f.
7.4: 200

Σ Lyc.
708: 360

Σ Nic.
Alex. 181f.: 368f.
Ther. 3: 29
11c: 406
70b: 257

Σ Soph.
OC 681: 62

Σ Theoc.
1.23–6c: 361
2.36a, b: see *Apollod.* FGrH *244 F 110*
2.120a: 330, 331f.
3.13b: 261
3.21: 407
3.40–2d: 331
4.57a, b: 212, 214
7.1a: 241
7.5–9e: 241
7.5–9f: 190, 192, 225
7.5–9g: 246
7.5–9i: 146
7.5–9k: 55n.60, 145
7.5–9l: 148
7.5–9n: 148
7.5–9o: 145f., 146f., 148, 229
7.40 ap. POxy. 2064 (T. 12a): 26
7.40f, g: 24
7.45–6c: 241

7.68a: 256
7.70a, b: 253n.97
7.109–10b, c: 134n.42
7.130–1d, e: 191
7.134b: 369
7.138a: 261
10.48–51e: 251
17.59: 27n.15

Seleucus Hom. *Glossai* (Müller)
22: 377n.34
48: 359
ap. Athen. 11.495c: 361

Servius
ad Virg. *G.* 1.212: 306

Simias *CA*
5: 279
8: 144
Glossai (Fränkel)
29: 367
32: 397n.61

Simonides *PMG*
542.29f.: 109
653: 385f.

Socrates Argivus *FGrH*
310 F 2: 185

Socrates Cous (Tresp)
4: 205

Solon *IEG*
4.1: 308
16.2: 180

Soph. *TGrF*
Euryalus p. 194: 105

Sophron *PCG*
26: 362

Sostratus *FGrH*
23 F 3: 96, 101, 129f., 139n.46

Statius
Silv. 1.2.252f.: 37f., 39, 63, 267

Stephanus Byzantius
Ἀργανθών: 329
Ἴχναι: 334
Φλιοῦς: 202f.

Strabo
9.5.14: 334
10.2.17: 106
14.2.19: 68

Strato Com. *PCG*
1.6f.: 401
1.23: 261n.106
1.36: 402
1.42f.: 403

Suidas
Ζηνόδοτος: 29
Φιλητᾶς: 23, 327n.15

Thales D–K 11
A 1.35: 108

Theocritus
1.27f.: 15
1.47f.: 263
1.77: 15
2.120f.: 330
3.13f.: 261
3.40f.: 330
4.38f.: 41
5.53f.: 39
7.3f.: 245
7.6f.: 146, 246
7.8: 246
7.10f.: 248
7.11f.: 227
7.14: 227
7.15f.: 227
7.19f.: 249f.
7.21: 250, 269
7.22: 237, 251
7.24: 251
7.25f.: 251f.
7.33: 228
7.39f.: 41, 270
7.45f.: 41
7.47f.: 17
7.54: 276
7.57f.: 253
7.58: 202
7.63f.: 61, 254
7.66: 255
7.69f.: 253f.
7.70: 237
7.71f.: 211, 252
7.76f.: 253
7.85: 165
7.92f.: 265f.

7.98: 315
7.118f.: 260
7.139f.: 269f.
7.136f.: 266
7.141: 270
7.142: 262
7.144f.: 259
7.147: 263
7.148f.: 268, 330, 406
7.154f.: 270, 407
7.155f.: 271, 410
10.4: 214
10.25: 39
10.50: 251
11.1f.: 14
13.5f.: 342
16.32: 325
16.52f.: 114
24.105f.: 16
Epigrams HE
20.2f.: 357
See Σ *Theoc.*

Theognis
218: 97
1229f.: 212

Theophrastus
HP 3.4.2, 3.6.1: 246
3.9.4: 296
3.18.2: 256
3.18.5: 171
4.12.1: 337f., 378f.
6.4.10: 214
De Odor. 26: 281f.

Tibullus
1.9.9: 318
2.2.5f.: 281n.122, 410

Timachidas Meg. *FGrH*
485 F 7: 390n.56

Timachidas Rhod. *Glossai* (Blinkenberg)
19: 365
28: 367

Valer. Flacc.
1.70: 321n.10
1.411f.: 209

Virgil
A. 1.50f.: 141
4.507f.: 141
4.645f.: 139f.
6.298f.: 337
8.322f.: 121n.25
E. 1.5: 15
2.28f.: 16
6.29f.: 295
6.64f.: 229
6.82f.: 66
7.4: 16
8.16: 249
9.1f.: 67
9.19f.: 67
9.27f.: 38f., 67
9.30f.: 67, 285
9.40f.: 67, 230
9.57f.: 67, 278
9.59f.: 248
G. 1.212: 306
4.116f.: 16
4.315f.: 15

Vita Arati ii (Martin)
p. 11.5: 24

Xenocritus Cous (Deichgräber)
311: 397n.60

Zenodotus (Pusch)
Ethn. Lex. pp. 174: 199, 201
Glossai fr. 2: 394

IV. GENERAL INDEX

Acheron: metonymy for Hades 107f.; *Volksetymologie* ἄχος + ῥέω 108n.10
Achnai: Macedonian/Boeotian/ Thessalian town 333f.
Aegean: SE—as literary centre 25f.
Aelian: refers to P. 54
Aeolian islands: at Tyrrhenian sea 95, 96; onomatology 105f.
Aeolus: impressed by Odysseus 97f.; hosts Odysseus 98, 99; wrath at his daughter's affair 104, 123; sends away Odysseus 127. See *Alcinous.*
aeschrology: see *Thesmophoria.*
aetiology: in P. 70, 127, 148, 156, 182, 239, 256, 290, 334; in A.R. 301; in Asclep. 70
Aganippe: confused with Hippocrene in Call.? 229n.75
aidos: and young maidens 124; ambiguous power 125; resides in eyes 125n.27; functions preemptively 125
Alcimede, mother of Jason: paralleled with Demeter? 300
Alcinous: and Philitan Aeolus 98, 101, 136; host of Jason 309f., 311f.; garden 240, 259f., 285
Alciphron: aware of details from *Demeter*? 64n.77. See *Index of Passages* s.n.
alder: metonymy for writing tablet? 319f.; in Greek literature 324
Alexander of Aetolia: and P. 51, 138, 245; treated P. in *Musai*? 51f.; took account of *At. Gl.*? 396, 398
Alexandria: and Peripatus 70f. See *Demeter, Dionysus, Museum.*
alphabetisation: in 3rd cent. BC 386
Amaryllis: beloved of Philetas in Longus 40f., 261
Amerias, lexicographer: 373
Ammonius: work on κῳμῳδούμενοι 54n.57
anachronism: anticipatory—in Hellenistic poetry 221f.
anagrams: approved by Arist. 71, 121n.25; in Greek poetry 121n.25 See *Lycophron.*
ananke: motivation for bold deed 107
Anaphe: suddenly appeared from sea 317
anaphora: with relative clause provides supplementary information 207; in epic catalogues 218
anise: chthonic associations 254
Antagoras, brother of Chalcon: inferior role in *Demeter* 246
anthology: P. in early- 58; of epigrams by more than one author 410
Antigonus of Carystus: quotes P. 56, 184, 186, 212; quotes verse 69, 184n.34, 186; describes custom to interpret gloss in Περὶ λέξεως 388. See *Athenaeus.*
Antimachus: *Lyde* scarce after m.-2nd cent. BC 34; in *Aet.*-prologue 43f.; and Mimnermus 44; and P. 45f.; 'heroic' *Lyde* 46; geographical veracity of Homer 95n.2; *Lyde* and P. *Hermes* 46; Dub. fr. 192 probably not by- 201n.53; *Argivorum iter* in *Thebaid* 233f.; interpretation of πηγός 402; scholarly point on στέφω 407n.4
Antipater Sid.: responds to antiAntimachean criticism 62n.73, 68n.84
Antipater Thess.: alludes to P.? 12
Antiphanes Com.: draws on *At. Gl.*? 72, 201n.53
Antoninus Liberalis: treatment of sources 126n.30, 406
ants: poetological symbolism? 39, 302f.; blindly follow leader 303n.143
Aphrodite: Doso 336; and myrtle 368; and Dionysus 331; magical power 330f.
Apion, glossographer: paretymology of πρόξ 374
apocope: in Antim./P. 46f., 193; commended by Arist. 71, 126
Apollo: Delian cult-statue erected by Meropian Coans 193n.43; sudden appearance to poets 227; leans on

golden lyre 249; in Cyrene 273, 274, 285; hair 280f.; purity 283; *ktistes* 285; and Horai 286; patron of poetry 289. See *Carneia.*
Apollodorus of Athens: attentive to P. 56, 392/poetica: 193, 215, 277/ grammatica: 360, 368, 399; and *Meropis* 238; criticised Call. on Homeric geography 95n.1
Apollonius Rhodius: Odysseus in West 95n.1; influenced by *Hermes* 137f.; echoes P. 117, 121, 299f.; alludes to *Demeter*? 298f.; locale of Jason/Medea marriage 309; influenced by P. on Jason/Medea marriage? 309, 311f.; epigrams 328n.16; influenced by *At. Gl.* 396. See *ants, Argonauts, Hesperids.*
apostrophe: 2nd person- 192; to *thymos* 117f.; of deceased to wayfarer 313
apples: subterranean associations 259; and Demeter 259; Atalante's- 330f.; wreath of- 331; magic- 330f.
Aratus: *leptotes* 51n.52; and P. 51; 'medical' poems 236n.83; πολυμαθής 326; glances at *At. Gl.* 379
Archemorus: see *Nemean Games.*
Archilochus: and Paros 64; encounter with Muses 250; in Theoc. 7 260
Ares: metonymy for knife/sword 336
Arganthon, mountain: 329. See *Hylas.*
Arganthone: eponymous heroine of Arganthon 329
Argolid: and Cos 72f., 202f., 338, 362f.; and P. 73
Argonauts: colonised Tyrrhenian coast 309; search water-source in A.R. 301f.
Aristaeus: allegedly treated by P. 184; Thessalian origin 182
Aristarchus: *Against Philitas* 29, 197f., 359, 374f., 377, 380, 394f.; veracity of Homeric geography 95; οὕτως to assert correct reading 379f.; conjectures against the vulgate? 374f., 382; mixed aorists 186f.; interpretation of: ἄγω 197f.; αὐλή 377n.34; γύαλον 358f.; γυῖα 173; ἔγχος 219n.65; νη- 154f.; σκῖρος 374f.; τύπτω 198n.48; φρίξ 382; φύζα 191; φωριαμός 377; readings in: *Il.* 2.111: 380; 9.472: 377; 12.277: 187; 15.71: 99; 21.126: 382; 21.252: 384; 23.332–3: 374f.; 23.879: 375n.29; *Od.* 4.567: 286
Aristophanes Com.: P. draws on- 72, 245. See *comedy.*
Aristophanes Byz.: influenced by P. 382, 395.
Aristotle: influenced P. 71, 207, 211f., 212, 242, 381, 386f.; recommends: synonyms 120; anagrams 71, 121n.25; apocope 71, 126; interest in: bees 183; riddles 212; proverbs 71, 124, 125; glosses 386f.; metaphors 71, 392; method of interpreting Homeric glosses 387. See *Peripatus.*
Artemis: Agrotera 336
Ascalabus: (child) turned into gecko by Demeter 237f., 306; (lizard) bites child in P.? 237f. See *lizard.*
Asclepiades of Myrlea: Arganthone myth 329
Asclepiades of Samos: public office? 36; and contemporary poets 50n.51; and P. 50; aetiology 70; ignores Meyer's first law 79n.99; in Theoc. 7 40, 260
Asclepius: cult on Cos 236, 282; and Demeter 236n.82
asphodel: and nether world 257
ass: braying—in *Aet.*-prologue 269n.114
assonance: in P. 69, 107, 121, 166, 205, 205n.55; in Mimnermus 45
Astraeus: host of Demeter in Nonnus 61, 172, 204, 210, 274
Atalante: see *Hippomenes.*
Athena: bone-pipes 212; long spear 218f.; fights Giants on Cos 238
Athenaeus: citations of/information on P. 56; draws on Antig. Car. 56
Athens: P. and- 72; ἱεραί 220; ἄστυ 221
Attica: and P. 72, 219, 263, 369f. See *Athens.*
aulos: and Demeter 210f.; in banquet 209; bone-pipes 212f.
Autolycus: and Odysseus 132; and Hermes 132; and Heracles 135; grandfather of Jason 312

bacchus, wreath: 365
banquet: in Call. fr. 2a.65 47; riddles in- 212; in *Demeter* 234f.

bathe: of Demeter and literary symbolism 289f.
Battis: see *Bittis*.
Baubo: 209
beans: despised by Demeter 255; chthonic associations 255n.99
bees: in Call. *HyAp.*/Theoc. 7 231, 277, 291, 292; and Demeter 181; engenderment 183; chastity 183n.30, 231; bugony 183; βουγενεῖς etc. 184f.; in ideal scenery 231; appear in spring 233n.80; divine 233; metaphor for poets 292; proverbial industry 292; originate in Hymettus 47, 304. See *Melissai*.
birds: talking 251; in Philitan *locus* 268f.; in Philetas' garden 270. See s. individual birds.
Bittis: allegedly alluded to in Call. fr. 1.10 13; spelling 31f.; identity 32f., 310n.3; θοή 34
Bitto: courtesan? of Samos 33
Boeotia: gloss in *At. Gl.* 360
book: talking 321 See *epigram*.
Bourina: and Hippocrene 47, 227, 248, 266; identification and importance 145; creation: miraculous 146f.; described in *Demeter* 146f., 149f., 228f.; instructed by Demeter 147, 229; paretymology Βού-ρινα 145, 148, 153; Chalcon's knee-imprint 148; reached through στενωπός 148, 229; metonymy for Cos 149f.; spelling 152f.; in meeting scene of Chalcon and Demeter 226f.; Ithacan spring as literary model 231f.; πίδαξ 291
Brasilas: legendary Coan? 248
bronze: purificatory power 276f.; and Demeter 277
bucolic diaeresis: see *metre*.
bugony: in P. 15, 184, 302; broad recognition (not in Arist.) 183; originates in Egypt 183; lost Hellenistic treatment 184, 303f.

cactus: 214f.
caesura: see *metre*.
cakes: Coan reputation for honey-sweetened- 181n.28; wedding- in *At. Gl.* 362 bis, 364f.; representing animals 363
Callimachus: address to Parian Charites 39, 47f.; influenced by P. 42, 396f.; *Aet.*-prologue and Theoc. 7 42n.38; proposed Mimn./P. to supplant Mimn./Antim. 44, 45; similarities between *Aet.*-prologues 47n.43; P. in original *Aet.*-prologue? 47; compares P.'s poetry with Coan vest 48f.; *Pinakes* and elegiac canon 49f.; paradoxography 71; antiquarian names 106; medicine 236n.83; spondeiazontes 76f.; Odysseus in the West 95n.1; discussed *hyces* in Περὶ μετονομασίας ἰχθύων? 201; adapts Hesiod's encounter with Muses on Chalcon's encounter with Demeter: see *Hesiod; Demeter* in epilogue of *HyAp.* 12, 38, 288f.; loves Cyrene 274n.118; assimilates Cyrenean Apollo to Coan Demeter 274; denounces common-place treatments of Demeter-myth 294f.; *HyDem.* emulates *Demeter* 297; echoes Hippocratic passage 299, 408; confuses word-order 332; first employed thematic classification 386
Callistratus: takes account of *At. Gl.* 360, 380, 381f., 395; supports same reading as Aristarch. 380; follows Zenod. against Aristarch. 395
Calypso: affairs with Hermes/Odysseus 127
canon: of elegiac poets 49f.
Carneia: 273
Castalis: Nymphs from—in P. > Theoc.? 268, 406
catalogue-poetry: popular in Hellenistic times 52; Hesiodic *par excellence* 52n.54
Catullus: allegedly refers to P. 13f.; motifs originating in P. 275f., 290
cavern: see *grotto*.
celery: and death 257
Chalciope, daughter of Eurypylus: married Heracles 192, 263
Chalcon: created Bourina 146f.; etymology of name 146; proceedings at Bourina 146f., 229; grotesque figure? 148, 182, 198, 242; attacked Heracles at Pyxa 190f.; entertained Demeter on Cos 225; influential meeting-scene with Demeter 226f., 249f.; piety 228; credited with advance of standard of

living 239; ancestor of Coan nobles 241; Χάλκων/Χαλκώδων 246; central role in *Demeter* with regard to his brother Antagoras 246; looked upon with favour by Demeter 250; garden 240, 258, 259f., 285; flocks 67, 194, 284f.; alleged statue at Bourina 146
Chares, commentator of A.R.: mediated P. fr. 22 to Theon? 27n.63, 311
chariot: see *Muses*.
Charites: address of Call. to Parian- 39, 47f., 281
Charon: sordid old man 337; in Hellenistic verse 337n.3
child: in P. 189, 237, 263; in hospitality scenes 263; poetological symbolism 47, 263, 408; fourth year end of infancy 263; loss of only child 284n.125. See *Ascalabus, Demeter*.
Chiron: entertainment of Heracles 135
cicada: in Philitan locus? 269; and grasshopper 270. See *ass*.
Clearchus, Peripatetic: biographical fiction 33; Περὶ γρίφων 212
Clitarch, glossographer: took account of *At. Gl.* 359f., 399
Clytia, wife of Eurypylus: featured in *Demeter*? 246
Cnidus: colonisation by Thessalian tribes 188f.; and Cos 298
colloquialisms: besides elevated diction 120, 168
comedy: derided P. as λεπτός 54f.; mentions *At. Gl.* 72; attended to in *At. Gl.* 341, 389. See *drama*.
compounds: μελα- 151f., 379; νη- 154f.; α- 155. See *endings*.
consolation: by adducing *a fortiori* parallel 107
Corcyra: Drepane 206, 301; hospitality 312; Jason/Medea marriage 309, 312
correption: see *metre*.
Cos: literary centre 25f.; intelligentsia in Alexandria 28; theatre 25, 72; honorary inscriptions 35n.28, 36; fine garments 49; sericulture 49n.46; synoecism 145; water-supply 145; timber 156f.; plane tree 'of Hippocrates' 156n.17; judges 177; honey 181; honey-sweetened cakes 181n.28; apiculture 182; witches 189; Thesmophoria 235n.81; procession of *kalathos* in Demeter-cult 194; flocks and wool 195, 285; fishing 198; sacrifice of fish 200f.; wine 203; observance of purity 211, 241; priority over Eleusis in cult of Demeter 216f.; medicine 236; University 28; reptiles 238; gods/heroes landing on- 238f.; inhabited by Giants 238; wealth 242; pulse 255; perfumes 259, 281; frequented by Nymphs 262, 264; Carneia 273n.117; ties with: Argos: see *Argolid*; Cnidus 298; Lesbos 252; Megara 390n.56; Nisyros 339; Ptolemaic Egypt 28, 36; Samos 50; Sicily 73; Thessaly 72, 182, 187f.; cult of: Asclepius 236, 282; Demeter 188f., 194f., 204, 216f., 225, 226, 234, 235n.81, 241; Hera 338; Nymphs 264; Panaceia 282
courtesans: early epigrams on 32f. See *Bittis, Lycinna*.
Crates, epigrammatist: identity 22n.5; epigram on Euphorion 22; spells Φιλίτας 22f.
Crates Mallota: veracity of Homeric geography 95; etymology of Κῶς 195n.46
Crete: in foundation of Cyrene 280; archers 193; interest in dialect of 22n.6, 193n.42, 260f., 397n.61
Crinagoras: epigram on Praxagoras of Cos 39
crowning: cups/mixing bawl 407; at funerals 258; at banquets 407. See *garland*.
cyceon: contained honey 182; substituted by poppy 306
Cycnus, Priamid: white complexion 209n.56
Cyrene, nymph: slays lion damaging Eurypylus' flocks 288; snatched away to Crete 280
Cyrene, town: glosses in P. 201, 359; cult of Apollo 273, 274, 285; and Callimachus 274n.118; oil and olive trees 282; perfumes 282; saffron 287. See *Crete*.

dancing: in cult of Demeter 210f.; at Chalcon's banquet 210f., 278, 288

Daphnis: Sicilian origin 65; brought to the limelight by P.? 65f.
Demeter: garlands 61f.; attributes denoting 'plenty' 142n.1; ὄμπνια 143f.; Thesmophoros 144; instructs Chalcon to well out Bourina 147, 229; and wells 150; sits down in sorrow 155f.; flies to find Core 216n.61; brings fruitful seasons 164f., 165; and spring 165, 233; and Moirai 167; locks 169f.; glowing godhead 169, 170f., 281; cult: unbound hair 170; fragrant unguents 170f., 281f.; honey 182; rotten flesh 182f.; wool 194n.44, 194f.; establishment in SE Aegean 188f.; processions of κάλαθος 194; wineless offerings 204; fire and torches 255, 287; pine-trees 295f.; in tears 173f.; angry at Zeus 178f.; and bees 181; purity 181, 196f., 211, 241; healing capabilities 189, 236, 237; flocks and pasture 194f., 285; and white colour 196f.; despises erythrinus 200; in Phlious 203; averts wine 204; and pipes 210; change of mood 209f.; entertained with dancing 210f.; grandiose language 217; goes around places to found her cult 225; thin vest 227f.; and political power 241n.87, 308; and Coan nobility 241; Deo 245, 305; leans on stick while addressing Chalcon 249; ardent thirst/eager drinking 253f., 306f.; receives Chalcon with sweet smile and sparkling eyes 250; and lark 251; despises beans 255; resents apples 259; nurses infants 263; and Nymphs 264f.; holds handfuls of corn and poppies 271, 305f.; and bronze 277; holds myrtle-branch 249; fragrance 281; barren after birth of Persephone 284; μουνοτόκος, *sim.* 284; ὡρηφόρος 165; and Zephyrus 287; and saffron 287; bathe 289f.; ἅλαδε ἔλασις 290; break of fast and Hesperus 294; and poetry 229, 409; and Erysichthon 297f.; and Triopas 297f.; at Corcyra 301; and poppies 305f.; Achaia 370f.; dark head-dress 405. See *Thesmophoria.*
Demetrius of Phaleron: met P. in Alexandria? 71; and Alexandrian Library 28; close friend of Philadelphus 28
Demetrius of Scepsis: first described P. as scholar and poet? 68n.82
dialect: -contrast in Hellenistic verse 218; -range in *At. Gl.* 390f. See *Crete, Cyrene.*
Democritus: work on Homeric glosses 385
Dido: and Polymele 139f.
digging: contrasted to interest in literature 324
Diodorus Elaita: 331
Diodorus ὁ ποιητής: *Corinthiaca* 331
Diogenianus, lexicographer: information on P. from Theon 58f., 171, 190; classification of material 384f.
Dionysius of Chalcis: identified πρόξ as ἔλαφος 373
Dionysius of Sinope: and P. 144, 358
Dionysus: βουγενής 184f.; in Phlious 203; effeminacy 209; and Aphrodite 331; patron of fruits/apples 332f.; and wreaths 344, 365; in Sicyon 344, 365n.17. See *Iacchus, Phlious.*
Diores, son of Aeolus: untypical name 104; in anonymous elegiac fragment 138f.
drama: Attic tragedy and Hellenistic poetry 175f.; Coan interest in- 72; satyric- in *At. Gl.* 389. See *comedy, mime.*
Drepane: see *Corcyra.*

eagle: sharp sight 383f.
ear: of cups/vessels 356, 357
Echemeia, wife of Merops: 193n.43, 262
Elegy: Ovidian—(*Am.* 3.1) and Philitan Demeter 169, 228, 249, 250, 275, 281
elision: see *metre.*
elms: in Philitan *locus* 246; chthonic associations 259; and Nymphs 265n.12
Elytis, Odysseus, Modern Greek poet: 167, 217n.62
Ennius: coveted public honours? 37, 315
Eleusis, hero: 222
endings: adjj. in: -αῖος 118; -γενής 185f.; adjj./nouns in: -ιάς 261, 262n.108; -ις 196, 258
entrance: with right/left foot 275

epicedium: 310
Epicharmus: influenced P. 73, 107, 135, 214f.; Coan origin 73
epigram: 'tail-surprise' 320; as book inscription 321; joint edition of -s 410. See s. individual authors.
epiphany: splendid beauty of godhead 169; at noon-time 226f., 250; earth-tremor 252; hailed by creatures associated with god 269; gait/footwear 275; hush of nature 278
Eratosthenes: Cyrenean glosses in exegesis of Attic comedy 359; *Hermes* 137; *Erigone* described tour around Attica 234; distinguished Macedonian/Thessalian Ichnai 334; studies on comedy and *At. Gl.* 359, 375
Eros: encounter with Philetas in Longus 15, 249 bis, 250 bis, 251, 277, 281. See *Philetas.*
Erycius: allegedly alludes to P. 16
Erysichthon: greedy infant 263, 408; and Demeter 297f.; literary metaphor 263, 289, 298, 408
erythrinus: identified as hyces 199; assexuality 200; despised by Demeter 200; sexually invigorating 200n.51
Ethemeia: see *Echemeia.*
Etymologicum Genuinum/Magnum: Philitan entries from Diogenianus 59; well acquainted with Σ A.R. 329; Nicander-Σ different from MSS 368f.
etymologising: by P. 392. Systematic: ἄμαλλαι 379; ἀποφώλιος 323; ἀτραπός 113; Ἀχέρων 108n.10; ἄωτον 357; Βούρινα 145f., 153; ἔριθος 371; μέλισσα 261; πρόκας 374; ὑποθυμίδες 368
Eubulides: *pseudomenos logos* 55n.59; appeared in Middle comedy? 340
Euphorion: and P. 51, 314, 330, 396; and *Mythographus Homericus* 129
Euripides: *Aeolus* influenced *Hermes* 129f.
Eurymedon, giant: aspiring lover of Hera 343
Eurypylus, Coan king: Thessalian origin 188, 190, 273; offspring of Poseidon and Mestra 189, 216, 297; wounded by Heracles 190; father of Chalcon and Antagoras 225, 241, 297
Eurytion, centaur: treated by Hermesianax 30n.19
Eustathius: quotes P. from Athenaeus' epitome 57; information on P. from Homeric Σ 383
eye: good/evil—of Muses 250

filth: washed away in sea and literary symbolism 290, 299
fleabane: in Thesmophoric *stibades* 256f.
flocks: indication of wealth 197; Chalcon's—in *Demeter*? 67, 194, 284f. See *Demeter.*
fly: most impure insect 302
fire: in mysteries of Demeter 255, 287
fish: ejected from heroic diet 198; sacrificial animal in Cos 200; stupidity 202; interest of P. 71, 198f., 381f.; collect. sing. ἰχθύς 201f. See *hyces, Thesmophoria.*
fishing: in Cos 198
foot: see *entrance.*

Galen: classification of glossographic material 384
garden: see *Alcinous, Chalcon, Philetas.*
Gargaphie: see *Argaphie.*
garlands: festive—with poetological symbolism in P.? 61f.; offered to dead 258; of apples 331; in *At. Gl.* 365, 366f., 368; of myrtle-branches 368. See *crowning.*
garment: Nymphs fabricating fine—in grotto 266, 267, 267n.113; Coan -s 49; *Demeter* likened to Coan—by Call. 48f., 267
gemination: ἰάκχα/ἰάχχα 366; Ἐχέμμας 193n.41
genethliakon-genre: 410
genitive: absolute—in Hellenistic poetry 163f.
Glossai: -collections 385; in Hellenistic poetry 386n.52. See *Aristotle, Philitas.*
gnomae: typology 109; ending hexameter 125
gods: beyond tears 173n.23; calm sea 278; receive protégé with sweet smile and sparkling eyes 250; sweet odour 281. See *epiphany.*
Graces: see *Charites.*

grasshopper: melodic 41; poetological symbolism 270
grotto: of Nymphs 231, 265, 266f., 267; place for composing poetry 267n.113

Hades: irreversible 113; sail to- 114n.17
Haleis, Coan locality: 241
hecataeon: 378
Hecataeus of Miletus: in *At. Gl.* 377; involved in Homeric exegesis 377; and Call. 377n.35
Hecate: προθυραία 378n.36
Helicon: Coan Nymphs and Muses from- 268, 406. See *Hippocrene, Nymphs.*
Hellenistic poets: learnedness 326; employ: synonyms 120f.; μέλα- compounds 151f.; -γενής adjj. 185f.; -ις nouns 196, 258; defuse tension with light remark 124f.; interest in: month-names 144; island-names 106; medicine 236n.83; glosses 386n.52; and tragedy 175f.; sound-effects 177f.; anticipatory anachronisms 221f.; name cities by eponymous heroes 222; popularity of Demeter-myth 225n.71; repetition of verb + cognate participle 323f.; erudite πόνος 325f.
Hephaestus: constructed Olympian residences 110
Hera:—Argeia introduced in Cos 338; exclusion of slaves/foreigners 338
Heracles: and Hermes 112, 135; invasion of Cos 190f., 338; flight at Pyxa 191, 234, 288; founder of Coan nobility 192
Heraclides Ponticus: Περὶ νήσων 106
Hermes: guides heroes in Underworld 112; puts to sleep 100; affair with Calypso 127; and Autolycus 132; in love with Polymele 132n.38; and Odysseus 112, 127, 132, 135; guides heroes in adventures 133f.; averse to war 137; lover of Penelope 134n.42; bequeathes qualities to offspring 134
Hermesianax: and P. 29; erudition 30; influenced by Peripatus 30, 33; *Leontion*: reproduces literary principles of P.? 30, 44f.; refers to P. 30f.; known in Rome 33; alludes to antiAntimachean criticism? 45n.42; influenced by Hes. *Cat.* 30; brackets P. with Philoxenus 53; disposition of poets 53n.55; scholarly question 198n.48; alludes to entry in *At. Gl.*? 401; Bittis 32f.; spondeiazontes 96n.92
Hermione: Demeter-myth 225f.
Hermippus of Smyrna: quotes P. 56, 199, 201; identifies hyces with ioulis 199; version of Demeter/Triopas myth? 298
Hermonax: *Synonyms* 120; discussed ἄμφωτις 356
Herodas: mim. 8 features P.? 17, 137n.44
Herodian: preserves frr. of P. 58, 123, 171
Herodicus: work on κωμῳδούμενοι 54n.57
Herodotus: interest in: ancient toponyms 106; glosses 377
Hesiod: drinks from Hippocrene 248; appreciated for erudition 52; catalogue-poetry 52n.54; and P. 52, 124, 240, 248; encounter with Muses and Chalcon's encounter with Demeter 52, 226f., 248, 250n.96, 251. See *Melisseeis.*
Hesperids: in A.R. 302
Hesperus, son of Astraeus: entertains Demeter by dancing 210f.
Hesperus, star: end of day's labour 294; time to return home/dine 294; Demeter's break of fast 293f.
Hesychius: P.-citations from Diogenianus 58f.; information from *At. Gl.* 400; information from Aristarch. *Against Philitas* 375, 395; Homeric *vv.ll.* of Zenod. and Aristarch. 375n.29. See *Diogenianus.*
hiatus: see *metre.*
hills: peaks as sanctuaries 223
Hippocrates: and P. 180, 381, 391; P. mediates passage from—to Call.? 408. See *medicine.*
Hippocrene: confused with Aganippe in Call.? 229n.75. See *Bourina, Hesiod.*
Hippomenes: footrace with Atalante 330f.; provenance of apples 331

Hipponax: first employed ὔκης? 201; in Theoc. 7 260
Homer: geography 95; synonyms 120; interest in glosses from- 387f.
Homeric Hymn to Demeter: model of *Demeter* 239f.
honey: of Cos 181; offering to Demeter 182; on Chalcon's feasting table? 182; in cyceon 182
hospitality: insult of- 103, 105. See *Corcyra*.
hyces, fish: sanctity 198f.; identification 199. See *erythrinus*.
Hylas: and Arganthon 329
Hymettus: place of origin of bees 47, 304
hymns: rhyme 217n.62
hypothymis, wreath: 368

Iacchus: mystic denomination of Dionysus 344, 365
Iambe: relieves Demeter 209
Iatrocles, Περὶ πλακούντων: took account of *At. Gl.* 363
Ichnai: Macedonian town 333f. See *Achnai*.
ioulis: identified as hyces by Hermippus 199
Istrus, the Callimachean: took issue with P. 56, 372

Jason: evokes ananke 107; unheroic treatment in *Hermes*? 137, 311f.; localisation of marriage with Medea 309; grandson of Autolycus 312
journey: opportunity for story-telling in epic 233f.

kissing: miraculous healing 237
kosmos: literary value 325
ktisis-poetry: P. presumed author of- 13, 238

Ladon, guardian of Hesperids' apples: corpse 302f.
lark: and Demeter 251; heralds early morning waking 251
Lasus of Hermione: *Hymn to Demeter* 225f.
Leonidas of Tarentum: and P. 51, 364
leptotes: and P. 49, 54f., 69; a marginal trend? 322. See *Aratus*.
Lesbos: and Cos 252; glosses in *At. Gl.* 368
lexicography: arrangement of material 386; originates in Homeric exegesis 387. See *Glossai*.
life: mixture of good and evil 316
Linus: description by Theoc. alludes to P. 16f.
Lipara: house of Aeolus 96; Meligounis 96, 105f.; Cnidian colony 106
lizard: hated by Demeter 237f.; represents maleficient forces 237n.86; rests ἐν αἱμασιαῖσι 263n.109; in *Demeter*? 237f.
loaves: names discussed in *At. Gl.* 364; cooked on fire 364
locus amoenus: in P. 230f.; constituents 230, 231; sanctity 233; Zephyrus 286
Longus: allegedly draws on P. 12, 15, 16; word-play Φιλήτας/φιλῆσαι 22, 65n.78; spells Φιλητᾶς 22; reproduces motifs from P. via Theoc.-Σ 64f.; attentive to significance of names 65n.78. See *Eros, Philetas*.
love: -making as wrestling 103; -images as sea images 115f., 123; driving motif in *Hermes*? 130f.
Lycaenion: see *Lycinna*.
Lycidas: literary statements 41f.; garland 61, 254f.; dear to Muses 63; bears features of Philitan Demeter 227f., 249f.; divine qualities 227n.74; sweet smile 250; banquet for Ageanax 252f.
Lycinna: postulated courtesan in P.'s poetry 33n.25
Lycope, Coan deme: 254
Lycophron: order of Odysseus' wanderings 111; anagrams 121n.25; takes account of *Hermes*? 138; draws on *At. Gl.* 360, 370, 396, 398, 402; Περὶ κωμῳδίας 398

Macareus, Coan historian: Heracles on Cos 263, 338
magic: in P. 189, 243, 330f. See *Aphrodite, apples*.
Marsyas of Macedon: Macedonian glosses 358, 364
mascarade bucolique: on Cos 244

Medea: *pharmakis* 189. See *Jason.*
medicine: on Cos 236; in Hellenistic poetry 236n.86; and P. 180, 215, 236f., 366, 391. See *Demeter.*
meeting scene: Chalcon and Demeter: see *Chalcon*; Simichidas and Lycidas 226f., 249f.; Philetas and Eros: see *Philetas.*
Megara: gloss in *At. Gl.* 358; colonisation of SE Aegean 390n.56
Meleager: P. not in *Garland* 327f.
Meligounis: see *Lipara.*
Melissai: Demeter's initiates 181n.27; Nymphs- in *Demeter*? 261f., 304f. See *Nymphs.*
Melisseeis, Heliconian king: and Hesiod's encounter with Muses 268, 406
memory: see *poet(s).*
Menalcas: treated by Hermesian. and Theoc. 30; in Virg. *E.* 9 plays role of P. in Theoc. 7 67
Meropes: indigenous population of Cos 188n.37, 401f.
Meropis, poem: not by P. 238. See *Apollodorus of Athens, Philitas.*
Merops, Coan king: hosted Rhea 239; paretymological link with μέροπες 401f.
Mestra: and Coan witches 189; returns to Athens from Cos 216
metaphor(s): in P. 71, 391f. See *Aristotle.*
Methodius: perpetuates notes of Theon 371f., 400; no direct access to P. 59n.67
metron: of funerary grief 314
metre, in P./contemporary poets: manipulation to produce special effect 74; contraction of bicipitia 75f.; spondeiazontes 76f.; trisyllabic spondaic ending 77; caesura 77f.; bucolic diaeresis 78; Hilberg's law 79; Gisecke's law 79; Meyer's laws 79; Naeke's law 80; versification of pentameters 80f.; contraction of 2nd pentameter-colon 80f.; hiatus 81; elision 82; epic correption 82; correption at 2nd syllable of dactyl 82; *muta cum liquida* 83; synizesis 83
milk: in banquet of Demeter 283
mime: attention of P. 389
Mimnermus: and P. 44, 45; and Antimachus 44; in *Aet.*-prologue 44f.; sonority of verses 45
Moirai: rape of Persephone 167
monologue: by Odysseus 115
Moschio Trag.: and P. 72, 143n.2
mourning: intensified with -αι-allitteration 121f.
Muses: chariot 38f.; foster-sisters of Philoxenus 53; and P. 62f.; and Antimachus 62n.73; look on young poets with favour 250; Heliconian—equated to Coan Nymphs 266
Museum: foundation of Alexandrian- 28; of Cos 28, 157, 237
Musurus: interpolated [Mosch.] *EB* 92 with a reference to P. 17
mutilation: of corpse in the *Il.* 383
myrtle: -wreaths 368; and Demeter 249
Mythographus Homericus: Hellenistic treatments of Homeric episodes 129
Mytilene: see *Lesbos.*

Nausicaa: and Polymele 136; κούρη 101n.3; alleged affair with Odysseus 127
Nemean games: foundation allegedly treated by P. 205
Nicander: *On the Colophonian poets* 29; *Melissourgica* 304; influenced Ovid's treatments of Demeter-myth 223f.; poet and medic 236n.83; interacts with *Demeter* 223f., 237f., 303f.; took account of *At. Gl.* 368f., 396, 398f.; *Glossai* 398f.
Nicanor of Cos: commentator of P. 25, 55; information on Cos to Theon 145f., 150, 191, 241
Nicetas Choniates: allegedly refers to P. 17f.
night: and φροντίδες 69
Nicias of Miletus: poet and medic 237
Niko: typical name of Samian hetairai 340
Niobe: in Hellenistic poetry 179; paralleled to Demeter by Call.? 279; makes fun of Letoids' clothes 279
Nisyros: ties with Cos 339

Nymphs: originate in Parnassus 406; and olive-oil 39; Melissai teach that Mimnermus is sweet? 47; in *Demeter* 261f., 304f.; and apples 261; and bees 262; attributes at end of pentameter 262; and Demeter 264f.; companions of Persephone 265; poplars and elms 265; teach how to write poetry 265f.; singing/dancing around wells 266; in grottoes 231, 265, 266f., 267; fine garments 266, 267, 267n.113; Coan and Castalian—in Theoc. 7 268; mingle wine 268, 270f.; and πίδακες 291n.131

Odysseus: in the West 95; σοφός 97; causes admiration 97f.; entertains hosts 99; acquisitive character 102; pun on: ὀδύρομαι 102; ὀδύσσομαι 103f.; flouts laws of hospitality 103, 105; evokes *ananke* 107; order of wanderings 111; lies 111f., 127; led to Hades by Hermes 112; incomplete *katabasis* 114f.; πολύτλας 115; pretends weakness 115; addresses *thymos* 117n.21; sent away by Aeolus 127; affairs with Calypso/Circe/Nausicaa 127; mistress at Troy 129n.35; and Autolycus 132; and Hermes 132, 135; summarises 136; entertainment by Polyphemus/Pholus treated by P.? 134f., 268; and Jason 312

olive-oil: in cult of Demeter 171, 281f.; of Cyrene 282. See *Nymphs.*

olive-tree: in Demeter-myth 171

onomatopoeia: from animals' voices 376n.82

Orion of Thebes: information on P. 371, 400; no direct access to P. 59n.67

Oromedon, Coan mountain: 241. See *Eurymedon.*

Orus: mediates Theon's notes to Steph. Byz. 202

Ovid: access to Antim. *Lyde*? 34; P. and Call. as erotic poets 33f., 63; spells Battis 31f.; treatments of Demeter-myth 283f.

oyster: -epigram 335f.

paegnium: catch-all term 328. See *epigram.*

Pamphilus, lexicographer: information from *At. Gl.* 357, 359, 362, 384, 399f.; mediated citations of P. to Diogenianus? 57; preserved summary of *Hermes*? 129; commentary on Nicander 368; referred to *At. Gl.* as ἐν Ἀτάκτοις 384; thematic arrangement 386

Pan: son of Hermes and Penelope 134n.42

Panaceia: cult on Cos 282

paradoxography: interest of P. 71, 243. See *Callimachus.*

parenthesis: γάρ in explanatory- 207

Parthenius: reads P. in anthology 58; *Erot. path.*: treatment of sources 126f., 130; notations 128; and Virgil 139f., 141; vocabulary from P. in *Erot. path.* 2 96 bis, 98, 100, 102f., 105f.

path: narrow—to Bourina 148f., 229; of song/speech 326f.

patronymics: affection for -ις/-ίδης- 100

pears: subterranean associations 259

pelican: glosses for/habitat 373

Penelope: mistress of Hermes 134n.42

perfumes: of Cos 259, 281; of Cyrene 282

Peripatus: influence on: P. 70f.; Hermesianax 30, 33; tendency to bracket Mimn./Antim.? 44; moderation in funerary grief 314; interest in: riddles 212; glosses 387; proverbs 71, 124; method of approaching Homer 387. See *Aristotle, Rhodes, Telchines.*

Persephone: accompanied by Nymphs 265; weaving 267; only-child 284

Phamenos, son of Teiresias: 186

Phigalia: cult of Demeter 167, 171, 182, 195, 204, 405

Philetas, Longan character: features hark back to P. 64f.; hierophant 60, 277; in love with Amaryllis 40f., 261; garlands 61; *praeceptor amoris* 65; fond of Daphnis 65; garden: hallowed 156; vines 204; shade 230, 247; flora 255, 405; fruits 260; surrounded by αἱμασία 263n.109; frequented by birds 270; plays ancient syrinx in banquet 211; sudden appearance 227; encounter with Eros: leans on stick

249; received with sweet smile 250; encounter at midday 250; addresses Eros 249, 251; feast on *stibades* 256; and Nymphs 265; and ωlραι 286. See *Eros, Longus.*
Philicus: reworks motifs from P. 307f.
Philinus, Coan glossographer: influenced by P. 237, 397
Philitas: presumed author of: *ktisis*-poem 13, 238; erotic poetry 32, 157, 328n.18, 332; poem on foundation of Nemean games 205; Κλῆθρη 13, 319; *Catalogue of Women* 13; *Meropis* 16, 238; bucolic poetry 66, 157, 321n.9; poem on his father 309f.; technopaegnia 328n.18; iambics 341; oyster-epigram 335f.; poetical onomasticon 402f.; allegedly referred to by: Catullus 13f.; Antip. Thess. 12; Nicetas Choniates 17f.; Theoc. 1 15; Theoc. 24 16f.; Plutarch 14; spelling 19f.; dates 23f.; said to be Rhodian 24f.; parents 26; teacher of Philadelphus 26f.; and foundation of Alexandrian Museum 28; epigrams on courtesans? 32f.; Bittis 32f.; Coan statue 34f.; public office? 36; alleged cult on Cos 36f.; covets heroic honours? 37f.; coda of *Demeter* contained literary declarations as Call. *HyAp.*? 38; wish for longevity of poems/ posthumous fame 39f.; claim to lead other poets 38, 303n.143; attacked his opponents? 40, 322; first expressed 'Callimachean' ideals 41, 43, 322; against 'heroic' themes 43, 137; and Mimnermus 44, 45; employs weaving-metaphor of texturing poetry? 48f.; in elegiac canon 49f.; and Xenocritus' Hippocratic lexicon 237, 397; weights in shoes 54; *leptos* in comedy 54f.; *leptotes* 49, 54f., 69; fictitious epigram on tomb 55, 69, 340; survival 55f., 128f.; in early anthology 58; as hierophant? 60, 277; and Muses 62f.; Κῷος/*Cous* 63f.; scholar and poet 68; erudition 68f.; rhetorical effects 69, 71, 322; coherence of word before caesura and at verse-end 70; and Peripatus 70f.; paradoxography 71, 243; metaphors 71, 391f.; method of interpreting Homeric terms 71, 387, 391f.; and Attica 72; and Argolid 72f., 202; and Southern Italy 73; and Thessaly 72, 187f., 334; manipulation of metre to produce special effect 74; oblique language 59, 103, 115f., 174f., 189, 208f., 243, 275f., 284f.; varies proverb 109, 125; symmetry of verses 69, 322; scholarly questions in making of poetry 173f., 179, 197f., 219f.; and Hippocrates 180, 408; allegedly treated: bugony 15, 184; Telephus-myth 310, 336n.2; interest in: foundation legends 71, 206, 208; medicine/medical language: see *medicine*; alleged leader of bucolic confraternity 244; treats monstrous creatures in human way 134f., 137; tragic diction 176; confuses word-order 320, 332; epigrams 32f., 327f.; treated Arganthone myth? 329; attentive to comedy/mime 341, 389; Homeric scholar 393f.; glosses in poems 396
Hermes: Odysseus in West 95; altered order of Odysseus' wanderings 110f.; not erotic poem 130; recasts Aeolus-episode 127; Odysseus central figure in Aeolus-episode 131; title 131f., 137; content 133f.; influenced by Phaeacian episode 136; influence 137f.; and P.'s literary program 137; handled: Heracles *chez* Pholus? 134f.; Jason/Medea wedding? 311f. See *Hermes.*
Demeter: title 223, content 225; and Ovid 223f.; grouping of extant frr. 226; *locus amoenus* 230f.; meeting-scene of Chalcon and Demeter 226f.; Bourina 144f., 246f.; tour around Cos 233f.; Heracles at Pyxa 191, 234, 288; feast at Chalcon's palace 234f.; coda of poem 38, 288; and Thesmophoric rites 235f.; reproduces primitive way of life 235f., 255; coeval science 242f.; features lizard? 237f., 243; and Cos 238; celebrates Coan nobility 192, 241; subversive power 241f.;

commodities 234, 242, 255, 259f.; omens and superstitions 243, 275f., 276f.; magic 243; innovative language 243; literary models 239f.; features Nymphs/Melissai? 261f., 304f.; poetological infant? 263; address to Coan Nymphs? 266; Demeter's entrance in Chalcon's palace 275f.; feast 209, 234f.; piping (and dancing?) 210f., 234f.; Chalcon's flocks 285; bathe of Demeter 289f.; attention to celestial phenomena? 294n.134. See *Bourina, child,* locus amoenus, *spring(s).*
Ataktoi Glossai: arrangement 384f.; utility 387; Homeric exegesis 387f.; quote verse 336f., 340f., 343f.; describe custom 388; sources literary 389f.; range of dialects 390f.; learned vocabulary 391; κατὰ μεταφοράν approach 71, 366f., 391f., 402; etymologising 392; *Hermeneia* 392f.; rejected by Aristarch. 394f.
Philoxenus, grammarian: reproduces Philitan interpretation? 381
Philoxenus of Cythera: bracketed with P. by Hermesianax 53; in literary ancestry of Call.? 53
Philteas, historian: name misread as 'Philetas' 14
Phlious, Argonaut: son of Dionysus 207f.; built Phlious 208; womanish features 209
Phlious, town: identified with Araithyrea 203; cult of Dionysus 203; excellent wine 203; name implies fertility 204f.; controversial archaeology 208
Pholus: entertainment of Heracles in *Hermes*? 134f.
Phylarchus: name misread as 'Philetas' 13; Hellenistic Coan poet 338
Pindar: bird-similes with literary content 42; and P. 38f., 52f., 240, 271, 292; *Hymn to Persephone* 142f., 292
pine-tree: and death 295n.136; in orgiastic cults 296
pipes: see *aulos.*
plane-tree(s): in sanctuaries 156; longevity 156; and intellectuals 157; in ideal scenery 230
Plutarch: reproduces comic mockery of P. (and Prodicus?) 54f.
poet(s): cult 36f.; hold public office 36; as τέκτων 42; honoured by native city 35n.31; memory 62f.
Pollux, lexicographer: classification of material 384
Polymele, daughter of Aeolus: untypical name 104; significance of name 132n.38; mistress of Odysseus 130f. See *Dido.*
Polyphemus: entertained Odysseus in *Hermes*? 134f., 334; treated by Hermesianax and Theoc. 30
poplar(s): in Philitan *locus* 246, 265; and nether world 259; and Nymphs 265
poppy: and Demeter 271, 305f.; and death 271; assuages grief 306
Poseidon: father of Eurypylus 189, 216
Posidippus: *Seal* and P.'s statue 35; held public office 36; epigram on P. (T. 3) 24, 43; co-editor of *Soros* 409f.
Praxagoras of Cos: Crinagoras' epigram on- 39; teacher of Herophilus 28
prepositions: inverted at bucolic diaeresis 78; between noun and adj. 176; arrive πρός/παρά + Accus., ἐπί/εἰς + Accus. in *Erot. path.* 96; εἰς + Accus. expressing 'the final outcome' 378
Praxiphanes, Peripatetic: discussed Homeric glosses 387, 391; one of the Telchines 72n.87
present tense: beside perfects 120
Prodicus: *leptos* in Attic comedy? 54f.
Propertius: alleged references to P. 15f.; hints at Hermesian. *Leontion* 33; references to P. from Σ Call. 59f., 275f.; couples P. and Call. 60f.; 3.3 reproduces course of action of *Demeter*? 61; P. and Call. as love poets 63
proverbs: in P. 71, 109, 125; approved by Arist. 71; light effect 124n.26. Systematic: αἰδὼς ἐν/ἐπὶ ὀφθαλμοῖς 125; ἀνάγκᾳ καὶ θεοὶ πείθονται 109
pseudomenos logos: and P. 55, 340. See *Eubulides.*

Ptolemachus: see *Polemarchus.*
Ptolemaeus Epithetes: agrees with Zenod. against Aristarch. 394f.
Ptolemy Philadelphus: and P. 26f.; birth 27n.15; support to letters 27n.16; statues for favourites/P. 27
pumice: for polishing verse 60, 290f.; in Nymphs' grotto 267, 290f.; in Demeter's bathe? 290
Pyxa: spelling 191n.39; Heracles' φύξα 191. See *Philitas*, Demeter.

Quintilianus: P. in elegiac canon 57f.
Quintus Smyr.: see *Vergil.*

repetition, of words: approved by Arist. 71; in epic 323f.; of sound-pattern 177f.
respiration: healing 237
Rhodes: and P. 24f.; Peripatetic establishment 72n.87; teeming with reptiles 238; appearance from sea 317
rhyme: religious gravity 217n.62
riddles: interest of P. 71, 212; in banquets 212. See *Aristotle, Peripatus.*
river: metonymy for land it flows through 149n.9 See *spring.*
roses: in graves 254f.
rustic: literary connotations of toiling- 322, 324; and wooden cups 356

saffron: chthonic associations 287
Salustius, commentator of Call.: preserved some of Theon's notes on P. 57, 191
schoenus: grows near rivers 337; *melankraninos* 378f.
sea: realm of winds 317f.; literary symbolism 278, 289, 290, 292f.; epiphanic calm 253, 278; cathartic power 289.
Seleucus Hom.: took account of *At. Gl.?* 359, 360, 399
Sicily: banquets 362; and P. 73, 95, 214f., 390. See *Syracuse.*
Sicyon: gloss in *At. Gl.* 365f.; excellent wine/cult of Dionysus 344, 365n.19; flora 365
Silenus: recites someone else's poem in Virg. *E.* 6 66f.
Silenus, glossographer: took account of *At. Gl.* 367, 399
Simaristus: took account of *At. Gl.?* 357, 361, 399
Simias of Rhodes: *grammatikos* 50; and P.'s poetry 50f.; ignores Meyer's first law 79n.99; treated *Thesmophorios* in Μῆνες? 144; took account of *At. Gl.?* 367, 397; quotes verse to illustrate gloss 388; interest in dialect of Crete 397n.61
Simichidas: song in Theoc. 7 alludes to Asclepiades? 260
snow: tears as melting 299, 408
Socrates of Cos: took account of P.? 144, 205
Sophocleius, commentator of A.R.: preserved some of Theon's notes on P. 57, 202, 329
Sophocles: *Euryalus* not direct source of *Erot. path.* 3 105; *Ajax* influenced death of Dido in Virgil 140
Soros, collection of epigrams: title 409f.; dedicated to P.? 410
sound-effect: imitation of—in epic/Hellenistic poetry 177f.
spondeiazontes: see *metre.*
spontaneous generation: 183f., 302. See *bugony.*
spring(s): created from tears 308; miraculous creation 148f.; pure—contrasted to big river 12, 229f., 291; as meeting point 226 See *Aganippe, Bourina, Hippocrene.*
Statius: refers to P. 37, 38, 39, 63
statues: of P.: in Cos 34f.; in Alexandria 27; of poets 35n.31; of Chalcon at Bourina? 146
stibas: in Chalcon's banquet? 255f.; Thesmophoric 256; as funeral bier 258
stick: symbolism 249; Demeter's 249. See *Philetas.*
Strato Comicus: refers to P. 23f., 31, 72; alludes to entries of *At. Gl.?* 401f., 403
Strato, Peripatetic: co-educator of Philadelphus 27, 28
suffix: -ωχ- 356n.1; -αλ- 358; Aeolic -λλ- 362
Suidas: places P.'s dates too early 23
swords: symbol of love/death in Virg. *A.* 4 140f.

synonyms: recommended by Arist. 120; in Hellenistic poetry 120f.
Syracuse: and P. 73. See *Sicily*.

talaros: symbolism 196; in cult of Demeter 194
tears: gods beyond- 173n.23; Demeter's 173f., 308; deceased calls on relatives etc. to refrain from 315. See *mourning*.
technopaegnia: origin 328n.18
Telchines: in Call. allude to Peripatetic establishment on Rhodes? 72n.87; and Antim./P. 45
Telephus, hero: erotic misconduct 310f.; alleged treatment by P. 310f., 329, 366n.2
Telephus, P.'s father: 26; alleged poem of P. 309f.
Theocritus: allegedly alludes to P. in id. 1 15; in id. 24 16f.; 'pupil' of P. 40; id. 7 tribute of honour to P. 40f., 244, 271f., 410; strongly influenced by P. 40; motifs from P. in id. 3? 41; ambiguous statement on P.'s superiority 41; id. 7 and *Aet.*-prologue 42n.38, 63; comparative clauses to make literary allusions 214n.60; affection for -ις forms 258; epigrams 328n.16; interest in dialect-glosses 357, 396
Theon: preserves information on P. 57, 399, then 39, 48, 58f., 150, 154, 171, 202, 257, 261, 275f., 284f., 329, 332, 361, 368, 370, 372n.25; access to Nicanor's commentary on *Demeter* 57n.63, 191; commentary on Call. *Hymns* 57n.64; took account of *At. Gl.* 399; on Philadelphus' birth 27n.15. See *Methodius, Orus, Salustius, Sophocleius.*
theophany: see *epiphany*.
Theophrastus: vocabulary in P. 168, 169, 242f., 370, 378f.; invited to teach in Alexandria 70. See *Peripatus.*
Thesmophoria: define course of action in *Demeter*? 235f.; *anodos* 235; aeschrology 243; *stibades* 256; pine-trees in—of Miletus 295f.; sitting on ground 156; and rotten flesh 182f.; on Cos 135n.81; consumption of fish 200
Thessalus, Coan leader: Heraclid 263
Thessaly: ties with Cos 72, 187f.; colonisation of SE Aegean 188f.; witches 189
thorn: poetological symbolism 270
thymos: address to- 117f.; loss of life 213n.59; of animals 214. See *Odysseus.*
Tibullus: employs motifs originating in P.? 281n.122
Timachidas of Megara: colonisation of SE Aegean 390n.56
Timachidas of Rhodes: takes account of *At. Gl.* 365, 367, 399; interest in garlands 365n.16
Timaeus of Tauromenion: and P. 73; Odysseus in Italy 111; common source of P. and Lyc.? 111; Argonautic colonisation of Tyrrhenian cities 309
tree(s): on Cos 156f.; cut down on mountain 320n.7; literary metaphor 321. See *wood.*
Triopas: crime against Demeter 297f.
Triops, legendary Coan king: 189
Triptolemus: dying infant of Metaneira 237
Tyrrhenian sea: Odysseus' wanderings 95n.1; colonised by Argonauts 309

Underworld: see *Hades.*

Variations: of genre: ὁ/ἡ ἕλινος 369; ἡ Ἴλιος/τὸ Ἴλιον 99; ὁ/ἡ νεβρός 213; of quantity: ἀίσσειν/ᾱίσσειν 382; ἰχθῦς/-ύς 201f.; of accentuation: αἰδώ/-ῶ 123; Φιλήτας/-ητᾶς 19; of breathing: ἄμαλλα/ἅμ- 372; ἕλινος/ἔλ- 369; οἴμησεν/οἵμ- 355; of form: Ἀθηνᾶ/Ἀθηναίη/Ἀθήνη 218; αἰδώ/-ώς 126; αἰψηρός/λαιψ- 317; ἄλειφα/-φαρ 264, 282; ἀλινδέομαι/-ίνδομαι 102f.; ἀμάλη/ἄμαλλα 372f.; ἄρεσχαι/ὀρεσχάς 172; ἀσκάλαβος/-ώτης 238; ἄστλιγγες/ὄστ- 172; -ατο/-ετο Aorists 186f.; Βούριν(ν)α/Βύρινα 152f.; δεῖνος/δῖν- 359; ἰάκχα/εἰάκ-/θιάκ- 366; ἰδών/ἰδῶν 381; κνύζα/κόνυζα 256f.; Μούρινα/Μύριν(ν)α 153; Νισούριος/-σύριος 153; πλατάνιστος/πλάτανος 158; Πύξα/Φύξα 191n.39; σκεῖρος/-ῖρος 374f.; Φιλίτας/-ήτας 19;

φιλαίτατος/φίλτατος 315; Φλειοῦς/Φλιοῦς 207; Χαλκώδων/Χάλκων 246; textual: *Il.* 1.524 ἐπινεύσομαι/κατανεύ- 379; *Il.* 2.111 μέγας/μέγα 380; *Il.* 21.252 οἴματ'/ὄμματ' 383f.; P. fr. 20.1 ψυχὴν/ζωήν 213f.; Theoc. 4.57 ῥάμνοι/κάκτοι 212, 214
violets: chthonic associations 255; in garlands 405; and Demeter 255, 405
Virgil: allegedly draws on P. 15, 16; Philitan motifs via Σ Call./Theoc. 66f.; influenced by Parth. 139n.47; and *Hermes* 139f.; and Q.S. 141n.51

weapons: nude 192
weaving: literary symbolism 48f., 247; and Persephone 267; by Nymphs 266f.
white: and purity/Demeter 196f.; complexion of homosexuals 209n.56
witches: Thessalian 189; Coan 182. See *magic, Mestra.*
wine: of Phlious 203; of Cos 203; in cult of Demeter 204; libations in funerals 258; mingling as literary symbolism 268, 271, 407; of Sicyon 365n.17
wood: writing tablet 319f.
wool: in cult of Demeter 194f.; excellence of white- 197; indication of wealth 197
wool-working: and Persephone 267; duty of female servants 195; in Homer/Hellenistic verse 195
word-play: Odysseus ~ ὀδύρομαι 102; Odysseus ~ ὀδύσσομαι 103f.; κράτος ~ κράς 109; ἀτραπός ~ α privat. + τρέπω 113; ἀλλά ~ ἄλλα 167f. See *etymologising.*
wrestling: as love-making 103

Xenocrates of Aphrodisias: erythrinus' sexual properties 200n.51
Xenocritus of Cos: Hippocratic lexicon influenced by P. 50, 237, 397

Zenodotus: 'pupil' of P. 29; royal tutor 29; influenced by P. in glossographic/Homeric studies 29; etymology of Ἀχέρων 108n.10; identification of hyces 199; arranged *Glossai* alphabetically 386; interpretation/readings in: *Il.* 2.111, 9.18: 380; 8.349: 384; 15.307: 187, 16.92, 18.174: 99; 16.666: 207; 18.39f.: 2n.54; 21.169: 395; *Od.* 4.205: 375n.29, 386; discussion of: τὸ/ἡ Ἴλιον/-ος 99; ἀλαοσκοπίη 381; (δ)άμνιον 375n.29, 386; βοτρυδόν 394
Zephyrus, son of Astraeus: entertains Demeter 210
Zephyrus, wind: in ideal scenery 286; ripening power 286f.; and Demeter 287
Zeus: authority over days, seasons and years 164f.; and rape of Persephone 178f.

V. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS, PHRASES OR TERMS DISCUSSED

ἀγαθός of abstract concepts 125
ἀγροιώτης 323
Ἀγροτέρα Artemis 336
ἄγω + inanimate object 197f.
ἀδὺ γελάσσας 250
ἄεμμα 192f.
ἀέξομαι metaphoric 160
ἄζη 391
Ἀθηναίη 218
Ἀθηναίης ἄστυ 219
αἴγειροι πτελέαι τε 246
αἰδώ 125
αἰδὼς ἐν/ἐπὶ ὀφθαλμοῖς 125
αἰέν plaintive 122
Αἰολίς 100
-αιος 118
αἶπος clausular 268, 330
αἱρῶ *comprehend* 323
ἀίσσω 382f.
αἰψηρός 317
ἄκανθα 270
ἀκήριος 283
ἀκόνη 397n.61
ἀκρομέριμνος 68f.
ἄκυθος 283f.
ἀλαοσκοπίη 381
ἄλειφα(ρ) 264, 282
ἀλινδέομαι, -ίνδομαι 102f.
ἀλλά ~ ἄλλος 167f.
ἀλῶμαι περί 95
ἅλωσις of Troy 99
ἄμαλλαι 371f.
ἀμολγεύς 359
ἀμόραι 362
ἀμφὶ . . . εἱλεῖται 337
ἀμφιλαφής 301
ἄμφωξις 356
ἄμφωτις 356
ἀναβάλλομαι 279
ἄνηθος 254
ἀνήρ *mortal* 109
ἀνία 122
ἀνύω ἀτραπόν 112
ἄορ 219f.
ἁπαλός 266
ἀποφώλιος 323
ἀρβυλίς 252
Ἀργανθώνιον 329
ἀσκάλαβος 238
ἄστλιγξ 171f.
ἄστυ of Athens 221
ἄτακτος 385
ἀτραπός of Hades 112f.
αὐλή 377
αὐροσχάς 369
αὐτὸς δείματο 208
ἀφέψαλος 336
ἀφικνέομαι εἰς/πρός 96
ἀχάη, ἀχαιά 371
Ἀχέρων 107f., 108n.10
Ἄχναι 334
ἄχος of death 108n.9
ἀχράαντος 291
ἄωτον 357

βαῖβυξ 373
βάκχος wreath 365
βασίλεια of goddesses 308
βουγενής 184f.
Βούρινα 152f.

γαληναίη 118
γαμήλια 364f.
γάρ in parenthesis 207
γεγονώς/ὤν 23n.7
γηρύω 213
γλῶσσα 385
γνώριμος 29
γραῖα of inanimate objects 158
γραμματικός 68
-γενής 185f.
γυάλα 358
γυλλάς, see *γυάλα*
γυμνός of weapons 192

δάκρυον collect. sing. 173
δείλαιος, -λός of poor intellect 176
Δηώ 245, 305
διακρηνάω, -νόω 270f.
διδάσκω of Muses/Nymphs 265f.
δῖνος 359
δίψιος 406

δμωίς 195f.
δολιχάορος 219
δράγμα 271, 372
Δωσώ *Aphrodite* 336

ἔγχος 219n.65
ἔδεθλον 285
εἶαρ 286
εἶδος *heat* 406
εἰλεῖται, see ἀμφὶ . . . εἰλεῖται
ἐκ Διός 164
ἑκάταιον, -ταῖον 378n.36
ἔκτοσθεν + abstract noun 110
ἔλαια (pl.) 281f.
ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ 339
ἔλινος 368
ἔμπεδον αἰέν 168
ἔμπεδος of Hades 168
ἐναντίον ἦλθεν 114
ἐνδύω of grief 279
ἐπέρχομαι of time 177
ἐπικρατῶ 108f.
ἐπιμίσγομαι 118f.
ἐπινεύω 379
ἐπιστεφής, -στέφω 406f.
ἔραζε ending 2nd colon 282
ἔριθος ~ ἔριον 371
ἐσθλός 277
ἔστι confirmatory 206f.
ἔσχατος *deep* 202
ἕτερος 275f.
εὔχυλος 370

Ζέφυρος, ζεφυρίη 286f.

ἤθεα 125
ἦ μὲν δή 116f.
ἡσυχίη 162

θαλύσια 245
θεῖος 222, 223
Θεσμοφόρος 144
θοός 34, 401
θρήσασθαι 157f.
θυμός 117, loss of life 213n.59
θυόεις 280
θώρηκος γύαλον 358f.

ἰάκχα 365f.
ἰακχαῖος 344
ἰανοκρήδεμνος 405
-ιάς 262
ἴδοι = ἰδέαι *eyes* 381
ἱεροεργός 339
ἱερὸν ἄστυ 220f.
ἱεροποιός 339n.5
ἱερός of Athens 220
Ἴλιον, Ἴλιος 99
ἰξύς 337
ἴον 255
-ις 196, 258
ἴσθμιον 366f.
ἰσθμός 366
ἰχθύς collect. sing. 201f.
Ἴχναι, see *Ἄχναι*

καί κεν + opt., dublicated 217f.
κάκτος 214f.
καλός *auspicious* 275
κάμνω οἶκον 110
κάπρα 376
κατ᾽ ἴχνος, -ιον 334
κατὰ κλέος 96f.
κατὰ κόσμον 325
κατανεύω 379
κεῖμαι *situated* 31
κινύρομαι 279
κλᾷδα 296
κλαυθμός 175
κλέος, see κατὰ κλέος
κλῆθρη 324
κλῇδες, see κλᾷδα
κνύζα, κόνυζα 256f.
κορέννυμι + abstract object 175
κόρη 101
κόρυδος, -δαλλίς 251
κόρυμβος 62
κόσμος ἐπέων, *sim.* 325
κράτος ~ κράς 109
κρεῖον, κρήιον 363
κριτικός 68
κρόκος 287
κρόταφοι 333
κύαμος 255
κύπελλον 363

λαγχάνω of gods 180
λαλαγέω 269
λαλίη 31
λευκολόφος 208f.
λευκός purity 196f., effeminacy 208n.56
λιβάς 293
-λόφος 208f.
λύματα 290

μακέλ(λ)α 324f.
μακρὰ βιβάς, *sim.* 187

μελα- 151f.
μελαγκράνινος 337f., 378f.
μέλαθρον 274
μελάμπετρος 151
μελεδῶ of Demeter 167
μέλεος 174
Μελιγουνίς 96, 105f.
μέλισσα 261
μελιτώματα 362
μένω ἔμπεδον 168
μέροπες 401f.
μέτρια 314
μήκων 271, 305f.
μῆλον 259
μητροπόλος 406
μίσγομαι, see ἐπιμίσγομαι
μνήμων Μουσῶν, *sim.* 62
μονή 100
μο(υ)νογενής of Demeter/Persephone 284
μο(υ)νοτόκος 284

νάσσατο 150f.
νεοστεφής 406f.
νεώρης 161
νη-, see νήχυτος
νήνιες of Nymphs 266
νήχυτος 154f.

ξεῖνος 315

ὁδίτης *mortal* 114f.
οἴματα 383f.
οἶμος 326f.
οἰνάρα, -αρέη 258, 369n.21
ὀλολυγών 269f.
ὄμπη 143, 304f.
ὄμπνιος 143f., 369f.
ὅμωρος 362
ὅρμος 366
ὀρόδαμνος 260f.
ὀροδεμνιάδες 261f.
ὄρπηξ 274
ὅσον ὅσσον, *sim.* 119
ὄστλιγξ 171f.
οὔ πώ τις 114
οὐδ' ὅσον/ὅσσον 119, 280
οὔπω 41, 161
οὖς of vessels 357
οὕτως in Hom. Σ 379f.
ὄχνη 259

πάσ(σ)ατο 306n.146
πέλλα, -ίς 359f.
πεπινωμένος 337
περὶ . . ἀμφί 262
περίεργος 69
πέσσω metaphoric 179f., 300
πεύκη 295f.
πηγός 402
πίδαξ 291
πιμελώδης 383
πίνος 337
πίτυς 295f.
πλάτανος 158
πολιήτης 30
πολλὰ μογήσας 325f.
πόνος literary 325f.
πότνια 142, 143
πραπίδες 176f.
πρόξ 373f.
προσαυξάνομαι metaphoric 168f.
προσηνής 314
προχοαί 151
προχύτης 361
πρώξ 282
πρωτοτόκος 284n.124, 374
πτελέη 246
πύξος *box* 191n.39

ῥῆμα 31
ῥινοτόρος 336

σέλινον 257
σεμίδαλις 362
σκαλλίον 361f.
σκῖρος 374f.
σκύβαλον 364
σκύζα 376
σοφός of Odysseus 97
σπιλάς 335f.
σποδεύς 364
στένω 270
στεφάνη, -ος 366f.
στιβάς 255f.
συνηρεφής 247
συνοικίζω 105
σωρός 409

τάλαρος 196
τάξις 384
ταράσσω of sea/love 123
τέθηπα 97f.
τέμενος 317
τετράενος 263
τέτρηχα 123
τέττιξ 269
τήκομαι metaphoric 299

τίθημι of statues 31
τριχάϊκες 245
τρύζω 270
τρύξ 254
τύμμα 215
τῶ οὐ/μή/καί + personal pronoun 163

ὑπαΐσσω 382f.
ὑπαλύσκω 382f.
ὕπαρνος 284f.
ὕκης 201
ὑπεζῶσθαι 378
ὑποδείδω 109f.
ὑποθυμίς 368
ὑφαίνω of poetry 247

φάρμακον metaphoric 180f.
φιλαίτατος 315
φιλήτης *lover* 22n.6
φίλος υἱός/ 207f.
φλιοῦς 204f.
φρίξ 381f.
φροντίδες 69
φύζα, φύξα 191

χαλεπός Hades/death 108
χαμευνίς 258
χάιος, χαός 245
χρυσάορ 219

ψευδόμενος λόγος 340
ψυχή of animals 214
ψυχὴν ὀλέσας, *sim.* 213f.

ων, see γεγονώς
ὡραῖος 165
-ωχ- 356n.1

CONCORDANCES

I. *Numbering of Fragments: Comparative Tables*

Ia. Powell – Spanoudakis

Pow.	Sp.	Pow.	Sp.	Pow.	Sp.
1	9	10	25	19	17
2	13 + 12	11	23.1–2	20	18
3	10	12	23.3–4	21	7
4	19	13	24	22	14
5	1	14	8	23	21.1
6	3	15	22	24	6
7	4	16	20	25	*All. Po. As.* 3
8	2	17	*All. Po. As.* .2	26	*All. Po. As.* 10
9	5	18	27	27	*All. Po. As.* 9

Ib. Kuchenmüller – Spanoudakis

Kuch.	Sp.	Kuch.	Sp.	Kuch.	Sp.
1	1	10	25	19	18
2	4	11	20	20	8
3	3	12	23	21	17
4	2	13	24	22	5
5	9	14	27	23	7
6	10	15	6	24	11
7	13	16	15	25	28
8	12	17	19	26	26
9	22	18	14	27	21.1

Ic. Nowacki – Spanoudaikis

Now.	Sp.	Now.	Sp.	Now.	Sp.
1	2	11	24	21	5
2	3	12	23.3–4	22	14
3	*All. Po. As.* 2	13	4	23	6
4	1	14	10	24	8
5	9	15	20	25	7
6	13	16	27	26	15
7	12	17	19	27	11
8	22	18	21.1	28	26
9	25	19	17		
10	23.1–2	20	18		

Id. Diehl – Spanoudakis

Diehl	Sp.	Diehl	Sp.	Diehl	Sp.
1	13	9	23.1–2	17	21.1
2	12	10	24	18	6
3	9	11	23.3–4	19	17
4	*All. Po. As.* 2	12	10	20	18
5	3	13	19	21	5
6	2	14	27	22	8
7	4	15	20		
8	25	16	14		

Ie. *SH* – Spanoudakis

SH	Sp.
673	16
674	21
675	T. 7, cf. fr. 5a
675A	26
675B	11
675C	15
675D	28

If. *HE* – Spanoudakis

HE	Sp.
1	*All. Po. As.* 4a
2	*All. Po. As.* 4b
3	23.3–4
4	24

Ig. Spanoudakis – Powell – Kuchenmüller – Nowacki – Diehl – *SH* – *HE*

Sp.	Pow.	Kuch.	Now.	Diehl	*SH*	*HE*
1	5	1	4			
1a						
2	8	4	1	6		
3	6	3	2	5		
4	7	2	13	7		
5	9	22	21	21		
5a						
6	24	15	23	18		
7	21	23	25			
8	14	20	24	22		
9	1	5	5	3		
10	3	6	14	12		
11		24	27		675B	
12	2.3–4	8	7	2		

Table Ig. (*cont.*)

Sp.	Pow.	Kuch.	Now.	Diehl	*SH*	*HE*
13	2.1–2	7	6	1		
14	22	18	22	16		
15		16	26		675C	
16					673	
17	19	21	19	19		
18	20	19	20	20		
19	4	17	17	13		
20	16	11	15	15		
21	23	27	18	17	674	
22	15	9	8			
23	11 + 12	12	10 + 12	9 + 11		3 (vv. 3–4)
24	13	13	11	10		4
25	10	10	9	8		
26		26	28		675A	
27	18	14	16	14		
28		25			675D	

II. *Numbering of Testimonia: Comparative Tables*

IIa. Kuchenmüller – Spanoudakis

Kuch.	Sp.	Kuch.	Sp.	Kuch.	Sp.
1	2	9b	23c	16	21
2	4	9c	23d, e, f	17	12b
3	5	10a	24a, b	18	14
4	6	10b	24c, d	19	17
5	9	11	25	20	16
6	8	12	19	21	1
7	10	13	11	22	15
8a	18a, b	14	20	23	26
8b	18c	15a	22b	24	27
9a	23b	15b	22a, c		

IIb. Nowacki – Spanoudakis

Now.	Sp.	Now.	Sp.	Now.	Sp.
1	1	11	24d	21	23d
2	12b	12	20	22	23e
3	11	13	22a	23	25
4	17	14	22b, c	24	19
5	15	15	21	25	18a, b, c
6	5	16	24a	26	27
7	14	17	24b	27	8
8	2	18	23a	28	10
9	16	19	23b	29	4
10	24c	20	23c	30	6

IIc. Spanoudakis – Kuchenmüller – Nowacki

Sp.	Kuch.	Now.	Sp.	Kuch.	Now.
1	21	1	18c	8b	25
2	1	8	19	12	24
3			20	14	12
4	2	29	21	16	15
5	3	6	22a	15b	14
6	4	30	22b	15a	13
7a, b			22c	15b	14
8	6	27	23a		
9	5	31	23b	9a	18
10	7	28	23c	9b	19
11	13	3	23d	9c	20
12a			23e	9c	21
12b	17	2	23f	9c	22
13			24a	10a	16
14	18	7	24b	10a	17
15	22	5	24c	10b	10
16	20	9	24d	10b	11
17	19	4	25	11	23
18a	8a	25	26	23	
18b	8a	25	27	24	26

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL,
D.M. SCHENKEVELD, P.H. SCHRIJVERS AND S.R. SLINGS

Recent volumes in the series

149. VINOGRADOV, J.G.& S.D. KRYŽICKIJ (eds.). *Olbia.* Eine altgriechische Stadt im Nordwestlichen Schwarzmeerraum. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09677 9
150. MAURER, K. *Interpolation in Thucydides.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10300 7
151. HORSFALL, N. (ed.) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil.* 1995 ISBN 90 04 09559 4
152. KNIGHT, V.H. *The Renewal of Epic.* Responses to Homer in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10386 4
153. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *The Gorgon's Severed Head.* Studies of *Alcestis*, *Electra*, and *Phoenissae.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10382 1
154. NAVARRO ANTOLÍN, F. (ed.). *Lygdamus.* Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber. Translated by J.J. Zoltowski. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10210 8
155. MATTHEWS, V.J. *Antimachus of Colophon.* Text and Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10468 2
156. TREISTER, M.Y. *The Role of Metals in Ancient Greek History.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10473 9
157. WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.). *Voice into Text.* Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10431 3
158. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book V.* A Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10506 9
159. SCHMELING, G. (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 09630 2
160. SICKING, C.M.J. & P. STORK. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10460 7
161. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Altera.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10624 3
162. GERA, D. *Warrior Women.* The Anonymous Tractatus *De Mulieribus.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10665 0
163. MORRIS, I. & B. POWELL (eds.). *A New Companion to Homer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09989 1
164. ORLIN, E.M. *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic.* 1997.ISBN 90 04 10708 8
165. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *A History of Roman Literature.* From Livius Andronicus to Boethius with Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature. 2 Vols.Revised by G.Schmeling and by the Author. Vol. 1: Translated with the Assistance of F. and K. Newman, Vol. 2: Translated with the Assitance of R.R. Caston and F.R. Schwartz. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10709 6 (Vol. 1), ISBN 90 04 10711 8 (Vol. 2), ISBN 90 04 10712 6 (Set)
166. DIJK, J.G.M. VAN. Αἶνοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10747 9
167. MAEHLER, H. (Hrsg.). *Die Lieder des Bakchylides.* Zweiter Teil: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10671 5
168. DILTS, M. & G.A. KENNEDY (eds.). *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire.* Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10728 2
169. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Quaestiones Propertianae.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10793 2
170. HEINZE, T. (Hrsg.). *P. Ovidius Naso. Der* XII. *Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason.* Einleitung, Text und Kommentar. Mit einer Beilage: Die Fragmente der Tragödie *Medea.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10800 9

171. BAKKER, E.J. (ed.). *Grammar as Interpretation.* Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10730 4
172. GRAINGER, J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10799 1
173. GERBER, D.E. (ed.). *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09944 1
174. SANDY, G. *The Greek World of Apuleius.* Apuleius and the Second Sophistic. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10821 1
175. ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. VAN. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMAHON, J.M. *Paralysin Cave.* Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. ISAAC, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. KEEN, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia.* A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. GEORGIADOU, A. & D.H.J. LARMOUR. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. HUNT, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. HAMEL, D. *Athenian Generals.* Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5
183. WHITBY, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power.* The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. SCHRIER, O.J. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. SICKING, C.M.J. *Distant Companions.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
186. P.H. SCHRIJVERS. *Lucrèce et les Sciences de la Vie.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10230 2
187. BILLERBECK M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca.* Hercules Furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6
188. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality.* The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *Roman Epic.* An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8
190. Hout, M.P.J. van den. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. Kraus, C. Shuttleworth (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. Lomas, K. & T. Cornell. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed). *History of Greek Colonisation and Settlement Overseas.* 2 vols. ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. Wood, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. Ophuijsen, J.M. van & P. Stork. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5
197. Pfeijffer, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar.* A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. Horsfall, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid 7. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. Irby-Massie, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. Grainger, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. Grainger, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. Solomon, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919

204. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book VI.* A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. Mader, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography.* Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum.* 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. Nauta, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons.* Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2001. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. Adrados, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable.* II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. James, A. & K. Lee. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. Derderian, K. *Leaving Words to Remember.* Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. Shorrock, R. *The Challenge of Epic.* Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4
211. Scheidel, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0
212. Keulen, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca* Troades. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. Morton, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. Graham, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6
215. Grossardt, P. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros.* Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende 2001. ISBN 90 04 11952 3
216. Zafiropoulos, C.A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11867 5
217. Rengakos, A. & T.D. Papanghelis (eds.). *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11752 0
218. Watson, J. *Speaking Volumes.* Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12049 1
219. MacLeod, L. *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles' Elektra.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 11898 5
220. McKinley, K.L. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine.* "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100-1618. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11796 2
221. Reeson, J. *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14.* A Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12140 4
222. Fried, M.N. & S. Unguru. *Apollonius of Perga's Conica:* Text, Context, Subtext. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11977 9
223. Livingstone, N. *A Commentary on Isocrates' Busiris.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12143 9
224. Levene, D.S. & D.P. Nelis (eds.). *Clio and the Poets.* Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11782 2
225. Wooten, C.W. *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12213 3
226. Galán Vioque, G. *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12338 5
227. Lefèvre, E. *Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen: Sophokles' Tragödien.* 2001. ISBN 90 04 12322 9
228. Scheidel, W. *Death on the Nile.* Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12323 7
229. Spanoudakis, K. *Philitas of Cos.* 2002. ISBN 90 04 12428 4
230. Worthington, I. & J.M. Foley (eds.) *Epea and Grammata.* Oral and written Communication in Ancient Greece. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12455 1